DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 993 SP 021 806

AUTHOR Gamson, Zelda F.
TITLE A Little Light on the Subject: Keeping General and Liberal Education Alive.
INSTITUTION National Commission on Excellence in Education (ED), Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Jul 82
CONTRACT NIEP820022
NOTE 74p.; Paper presnted at a Panel Discussion on College Curriculum of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (Kingston, RI, August 27-28, 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; Access to Education; College Faculty; *Core Curriculum; Educational Change; *Educational Trends; Elective Courses; *General Education; Government Role; Higher Education; Holistic Approach; Institutional Characteristics; *Liberal Arts; *Outcomes of Education; *Self Actualization; Student Characteristics
IDENTIFIERS *National Commission on Excellence in Education; *National Project IV

ABSTRACT

This paper on the state of general and liberal education in the United States discusses a project which sought to examine and improve general and liberal education programs at the higher education level. The first part of this paper delineates the undermining of liberal education in the nation's colleges and universities following World War II. The second part describes National Project IV, which brought together representatives from 14 diverse colleges and universities to examine conceptions and practices of liberal education from the perspective of their own programs. The third section presents a discussion on the context and content of the 14 programs as they operate within the organizational structure of their particular educational community. Comments and reflections from students in the 14 programs are presented in the fourth part. The fifth part contains a summary of the individual and social benefits accruing from these general and liberal education programs and offers recommendations for improvement. Appendix A summarizes major features of the institutions and the programs that were part of National Project IV, and their curriculum designs. The second and third appendixes summarize characteristics of the 14 institutions, and characteristics of students participating in the programs. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED225993

This publication was prepared with funding from the U.S. Department of Education, under contract #NIE P820022. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgement in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not necessarily represent those of the U.S. Department of Education.

A Little Light on the Subject: Keeping General and Liberal Education Alive

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Paper Presented to:
The National Commission on Excellence in Education

Zelda F. Gamson
Center for the Study of Higher Education
The University of Michigan
July, 1982

SP 021 806

CONTENTS

Part I: The Recent History of General and Liberal Education 1-11

Part II: The Varieties of General and Liberal Education With Some Underlying Common Principles 12-25

Part III: The Context of Content and Intellectual Communities 26-32

Part IV: The Students Speak 33-44

Part V. Summary and Recommendations 45-48

Footnotes 49-50

Appendix A: The Fourteen Programs at a Glance

Appendix B: Characteristics of the Fourteen National Project IV Institutions Compared to All U.S. Colleges and Universities

Appendix C: Characteristics of Students in National Project IV Programs and Universities Compared to All Students Enrolled In U.S. Colleges and Universities

Bibliography

Part I: The Recent History of General and Liberal Education

Argument

> Two forces undermined general and liberal education after World War II: the expansion of research and graduate education in the 1950s and 1960s, then popular reforms in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Declining resources, insufficiently prepared students, and vocationalism forced colleges and universities to do something about undergraduate education. By the late 1970s, faculty members and administrators began to take general and liberal education seriously, first by shoring up standards, then by turning back to basics, and finally by looking at the meaning of general and liberal education. This revival seems to be taking hold across the spectrum of college and universities.

The undergraduate curriculum in U.S. colleges and universities has been more responsive to external imperatives than most casual observers may realize. This has been true throughout the history of U.S. higher education (Rudolph, 1977) but it was especially obvious during the period following World War II, when federal support, rapidly shifting birth rates, and market forces profoundly influenced colleges and universities. All of these factors tended to push the undergraduate curriculum away from general and liberal education toward specialization. How this happened, especially in the 1960s and 1970s, is the subject of this section.

Throughout the century the number and range of subjects taught, many of them connected with occupational preparation, had expanded the boundaries of the undergraduate curriculum. The effect of this trend was to erode the coherence of the curriculum, especially outside the major. Despite protests from educators and public leaders, whose views were most prominently set out in a report issued in 1945 by Harvard entitled General Education in a Free Society and by the report of the President's Commission on Higher Education for Democracy issued in 1947, the trend continued relatively unchecked throughout the postwar period (Levine, 1978).

It is a rather backhanded compliment to say that college and university faculties never let the non-specialized components of the undergraduate curriculum disappear entirely. For whatever reason--a genuine belief in the importance of a more general education or the more political agenda of maintaining parity across the disciplines--the postwar period saw the virtual domination of the distribution system as the way of insuring that students would receive a broad education. Distribution systems required that students take a minimum number of courses to cover specific academic domains, usually divided into the natural sciences, social sciences and humanities. (English composition, basic mathematics and a foreign language were also typically required.) The distribution requirement permitted students to choose from a list of approved courses. As time passed, the number of courses expanded to the

point that most subjects, including pre-professional ones in some schools, and many substitutions (especially for science courses) could satisfy distribution requirements.

Distribution systems have a certain political and administrative simplicity, and by the early 1970s, 85% of all colleges and universities had them (Levine, 1978). Faculties across the country could institute them with a minimum of discussion. Every discipline could display its wares on a fairly equal basis in the marketplace of courses, thus avoiding the ideological and territorial implications of the question of which subjects were more valuable for a general and liberal education. Students could pretty much make their own choices, which diffused any potential discontent. And counselors and registrars could quickly check students' records to make sure they had met distribution requirements without bothering the faculty.

If the mainstream was drawing most schools into the distribution current, some colleges followed other tributaries. Some offered core curricula with a small number of courses that all or most of their students had to take in order to meet their general education requirements. The model for this approach was put forward by the University of Chicago under Robert Hutchins in the 1930s and 1940s. Other models of the core curriculum included those at St. John's College and at the Experimental College of the University of Wisconsin. Plainly running against the tide, core curricula were likely to turn into distribution systems (Blackburn et. al., 1976). By the early 1970s, they were to be found in 10% of all American colleges and universities (Levine, 1978).

At the other extreme were free elective systems, which allowed students to create a general education based on courses they chose (Brown University is a current exemplar of this approach). While only 2% of colleges and universities had such free elective systems in the early 1970s, the tendency of higher education until then had been to move toward free electives from distribution requirements (Blackburn et. al., 1976).

During the era of the "organization man" and "other-direction," students and their parents took being "well-rounded" as an important justification for the liberal arts. The notion of "breadth" and being acquainted with the great works of Western Man took on a myth-like quality. Everyone accepted it on faith that "the great works" meant something grand. After all, the catalogue said so.

By the late 1960s, this faith had been thoroughly shaken. How had this happened in so short a time? The story is a complicated one, but it can be sketched briefly. Federal support of higher education reached its height just about the time that the baby boom generation (the largest generation in the history of the nation) began to reach college age in the early 1960s. Affluence and the increasing importance of a college degree as a credential for access to good jobs brought a larger proportion of high school graduates than ever before into colleges and universities (Collins, 1979). After the launching of Sputnik, higher education really took off, with the number of graduate students

increasing dramatically, many of them supported by government grants and fellowships. Brilliant and not-so-brilliant Ph.D.s became college professors. Most were trained when there was a great deal of money around for research, and most of this research was highly specialized.

Government and foundation grants, combined with the strong bargaining power of the faculty when there were not enough of them to go around, led to greater faculty control over the curriculum. Academic departments began to exert more influence over the curriculum than they ever had, especially in research universities and selective liberal arts colleges. Faculty power grew even in denominational colleges and junior colleges--schools known for their powerful presidents and topdown management. Given a free hand to teach the subjects they wanted to teach in any way they wanted to teach them, recent Ph.D.s across the country brought what Christopher Jencks and David Riesman (1968) called "the academic revolution" to the hinterland. The tough model of the "university college"--high standards, advanced scholarship, graduate school interests--spread unevenly but took hold in many of the schools that had to fight hard to attract faculty in the early years of expansion. Church-related schools became secular, single-sex schools became co-ed, single-race schools became integrated, teachers' colleges became comprehensive (Pace, 1974; Hodgkinson, 1971; Greeley, 1969; Pace, 1972; Keeton, 1971). By the late 1960s, most faculty members, even in small colleges, had become specialists in a certain discipline--biology, sociology--with special knowledge about a field within a certain discipline--microbiology, stratification. Even the faculty who never again did any scholarly work after their Ph.D. dissertations--and the majority of Ph.D.s did not--thought of themselves as biologists or sociologists, not educators. The occupation may have been college professor, but the preoccupation had become a specialized field. And there were many rewards for disciplinary specialization: a sense of community with fellow specialists and tangible benefits like good salaries, promotions, tenure, grants and travel.

Identifying so much with a discipline weakened the faculty's loyalty to the schools that employed them and to their colleagues in other disciplines. If a job went sour, they could go somewhere else. The disciplines grew more arcane, and it became harder for faculty members in the same school to engage with one another about ideas and values (Sloan, 1979; Smith, 1981; Boyer and Levine, 1981; Bowen, 1977). In the larger schools, college professors no longer participated in what once was called a "community of scholars" but now sounded faintly antiquated (Birnbaum, 1973). Important discoveries were being made at the frontiers of knowledge, to be sure, but the average faculty member did not live there. Nevertheless, specialization and the image of the university college dominated the thinking of college teachers across the country.

The results were disastrous for undergraduate education, especially general and liberal education. The enrollment boom of the 1960s brought anonymous classes and cavernous dormitories to large institutions, especially those in the public sector. Courses for non-majors, the bastards of the academic family, were usually large. Faculty in universities took their graduate students most seriously, and those in

colleges without graduate students tried to transform their good undergraduate students into junior graduate students. Middling to poor students were neglected and good students were likely to receive similar treatment outside their majors (Geiger, 1980). While this was happening, general education requirements were being dropped while concentration requirements were being maintained or even expanded (Blackburn, et. al., 1976). Faculty were rewarded for, and usually preferred, teaching the specialties they had acquired in graduate school. The result: the curriculum outside of departmental majors--general education in particular--fell into the cracks between departments, with no one clearly responsible for it (Boyer and Levine, 1981).

The education of undergraduates, then, became shaped increasingly by the interests and styles of the disciplines, which tended to value depth over breadth, method over meaning, detachment over engagement. Introductory courses which met liberal arts or general education requirements tended to be taught as if all the students taking them were going to be majoring in that field. Teaching from such a perspective has the advantage of drawing on the concerns that animate the teacher, but the assistant professors and graduate student teaching assistants who typically taught introductory courses were unlikely to teach them with the same kind of enthusiasm that they brought to their graduate seminars and research. Multiply one of these courses by four or five and you have the average freshman's course load in most universities and quite a few colleges during the 1960s and 1970s: a series of isolated bits of knowledge delivered in large lecture halls by unevenly prepared young faculty members.

Typically, the students in the early period of expansion--roughly the late 1950s through the late 1960s--were well-prepared academically. Feeling their oats and firmly in charge, the faculty could lay on more readings and harder assignments. Competition for the best schools and for good grades became fierce. Although some students pressed for less competition and fewer requirements in the late 1960s, most conformed to faculty expectations (Riesman, 1981).

The "New" Students and Populist Reforms

The civil rights movement brought into the general culture the first in a series of pressures for new entitlements for groups under-represented in the mainstream. The counterculture, the women's movement and various human potential movements introduced new conceptions of human relationships. And the antiwar movement challenged some of the most powerful institutions in the society. In colleges and universities across the country, these social movements played off one another, raising fundamental questions about who could be educated, what should be taught, how, and to what ends. They questioned especially the tradition of liberal education, for centuries closely associated with the formation and perpetuation of elites and their culture. Experiments began to spring up in colleges and universities across the country in response to these movements--Black Studies programs, Women's Studies, cluster colleges, field studies programs, individualized studies, problem-oriented interdisciplinary programs (Peterson et. al., 1979; Grant and Riesman, 1978; Riesman, 1981; Heiss, 1973; Levine and Weingart, 1973; Gould, 1973; Hodgkinson, 1971).

Enter the "new students," who began to attend college in large numbers in the early 1970s under federal and state aid programs (Cross, 1971). New institutions were founded and old ones expanded to take advantage of the new student pools. Public colleges and universities, large schools and commuter campuses grew most during this period. Attaining a college education in an institution close to home became a possibility for a large proportion of the U.S. population, and more adults began to populate higher education.

The entry of adult students--who comprise about one-third of those enrolled in colleges and universities today--is a major, often unrecognized development. Special programs, even whole colleges, offering learning at a distance, credit for life experience, and individualized study have come into existence because of them. There are more women than men in this group, and they are there because of the impact of economic pressures, changes in family life, and the women's movement on women's personal and career expectations.

While faculty members who have taught adults usually find them to be more serious about their work than younger students, they are hardly the young versions of themselves faculty had come to expect their students to be in the 1960s. The new students--whether older or younger, male or female--did not live in circumstances that encouraged the leisurely pursuit of truth. Most of them commuted to college, studied part-time, had family responsibilities, dropped in and out of school, or worked while studying. They tended to go to the schools that had expanded most during the 1960s--state colleges (normal schools turned general purpose institutions), community colleges and proprietary schools--and schools that needed them in the 1970s in order to survive--typically private colleges that were neither selective nor well subsidized. For many of these students, "school" did not evoke pleasant memories. They came to college with poor basic skills.(1) Quite a few thought of themselves as not very smart, certainly not "real" college types. They were often inarticulate in class, especially when it came to abstract ideas and intellectual discussions. As a result, they had a tendency to hide. They found practical subjects less threatening than highfallutin ones. They certainly did not gravitate naturally to the liberal arts (Cross, 1971; Cross, 1980; Cross, 1981; Peterson, 1979), nor did they talk much (as their predecessors had two decades earlier) about becoming "well-rounded."

Under fire from legislators and the public to show they were accountable, and under the more severe pressure of declining enrollments, some colleges and universities began to confront the question of quality. Mastery learning, remedial programs, programmed instruction, computer-based instruction and competence-based education were early, technocratic responses to the decline in student preparation and the inability of the conventional approaches to undergraduate education to deal adequately with the problem (Grant, et. al., 1979).

These problems were located almost entirely in the non-elite schools but by the 1970s they began to inflitrate the "core" of American colleges and universities. The "old students" in the good colleges began to look a little like the new students: their SAT scores were down and they couldn't write or compute very well. The new students fared

worse, especially in large public institutions. Rushed through abbreviated terms (the earlier expansion of higher education had coincided with the quartering and trimestering of the traditional semester system), taking four to six courses each term if full-time, competing with fellow students for space and grades, sometimes working to meet expenses, they could barely keep up with regular course requirements. Already more harried by the struggles of everyday life than more privileged students, these new students tried to get by. Few of them found much in their contacts with teachers and fellow students to ease their toil. In classes taught by overworked regular faculty or moon-lighting part-timers, there were few opportunities for students to get to know one another or their teachers.

It took a while for most faculties to notice the decline in students' academic skills and even longer for them to see that they should do something about it. Few saw the weaknesses in the undergraduate curriculum. And hardly any noticed the deteriorating quality of life in their institutions. Then, in 1977, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching declared general education a "disaster area." The gaps between the faculty and the students, even in the elite schools of the nation, could no longer be ignored. Faculty trained to deal with the fine points of their areas of specialization wanted research papers when their students could not even write coherent two-page essays. They expected textual analysis when their students could not summarize the plot of a novel. They asked for criticism of an argument when their students could not carry on a logical discussion. Few faculty knew how to teach "skills"; many felt that was the job of education specialists and English teachers. Nor could "skills" be laid down as requirements since many of the general education requirements in composition, mathematics and foreign languages that had been common during the 1950s and most of the 1960s had been abandoned by faculties across the country (Blackburn, et. al., 1976). Even the most idealistic college teachers found themselves denigrating students. Not surprisingly (since it has happened before in American education), faculties in non-selective schools drifted into a resigned acceptance of low student performance, sugar-coated assignments, and mutual boredom. Without much conviction or vision, more colleges and universities across the country introduced "developmental" or "remedial" courses. These were typically separate operations, financed by federal or state funds, in student services offices or in entirely new offices that were organizationally distant from the liberal arts departments.

Then, as the economy began its downward turn and as the job market for liberal arts graduates began to shrink, the era of "defensive credentialism" (get a college degree just to hold onto what you have) and "vocationalism" (only study things that will help you get a job) set in. As a college education took on the meaning of yet another public good, students became consumers. And a decreasing number were interested in buying a liberal education. As a result, faculties had even more reason to feel a gap between themselves and their students. Students and their parents worried about the "marketability" of the B.A. and faculty in the traditional disciplines found they were unable to attract as many students, bright or otherwise, into their fields as they had in the 1960s. The federal government reinforced this trend by

disproportionately supporting engineering, life sciences and physical sciences, fields outside the traditional liberal arts (Mayville, 1980). This happened just when most faculty could neither say why the liberal arts were valuable nor require students to take them. The word was out in the middle classes that higher education was no longer a growth industry and students who ten years earlier would have gone to graduate school shifted to law or medical school. Middling students were not interested in the traditional liberal arts subjects either, since they knew that they would have to find a place for themselves in more applied fields like engineering and business. And the students who had little choice scrambled for what was left--vocations and semi-professions like human services, communications, and computers. The non-elite schools were hit hardest by these sudden shifts in student preferences and many rushed headlong into concocting vocational programs in all sorts of fields for which the job market looked promising--computers, social work, nursing, medical technology. Even traditional liberal arts colleges discovered that they had become de facto vocational colleges as their students shifted their allegiance from the liberal arts to business and engineering, law and medicine (Gerger, 1980).

We noted earlier that a tendency toward specialization and practicality had begun earlier in the century. But it was only until the last fifteen years that it looked as if general and liberal education might disappear from some schools altogether. If this happened the faculty would pay a high price. The majority of the faculty had been trained in the 1950s and 1960s, when the dominance of the disciplines was at its height. Most of them were now tenured but they faced a bleak future: fewer students, less research money, more difficult teaching. As the grants they had taken for granted in the 1960s began to dry up, they were forced to teach more. But teaching was harder now for faculty in the traditional liberal arts subjects. Further, there were fewer alternatives, since academic jobs were scarce and few faculty could relocate even if they were very productive. It did not help that public confidence in higher education had eroded and that power was shifting from the faculty to the administration and outside agencies.

In the meantime, the students were voting with their feet. Many disciplines in arts and sciences, especially the humanities, found that they could no longer attract the students they wanted, let alone those they did not want. How could they bring the students back, when the disciplines had become so esoteric that they were hard to explain to non-specialists? Unfortunately, most of the innovations of the 1960s and early 1970s remained pretty much on the margins of their institutions, so they could offer only limited hope for renewing the liberal arts. Further, the faculty as a corporate body was so fractured that it could not present a coherent conception to students who were themselves divided by class, race, gender and age differences. It was clear that a collective response was called for, but it was difficult to mobilize the faculty to the task, especially in schools most committed to specialization and diversity.

Renewal or Despair?

Some academics began to talk about higher education as a dying industry and soon the press picked up the theme. Caroline Bird (1975) and Richard Freeman (1976) questioned the point of college at all and

recommended their own versions of de-schooling. They pointed out that a college education did not seem to add anything to people's lives. If something good happened to students in college, it was because they came from well-educated families or because they had the aptitude for college work. Several researchers showed that the colleges that claimed to benefit their students merely selected those who already had the qualities they took the credit for (Astin, 1968; Chickering, 1971). The argument, supported by sophisticated quantitative research, went something like this: there was no "truth in advertising" when it came to what colleges claimed they did for their students; the high-flown virtues extolled in college catalogues were so much hot air. Well-endowed colleges looked as if they were doing something important for their students because they had a facade that said "college," but a college degree could no longer guarantee a good life, let alone a good job. It might not even guarantee a job at all. The English B.A. waiting on tables or driving a cab became a familiar entry in this bleak accounting. Later, it was the English Ph.D. and the assistant professor of English denied tenure.

Carnegie Commission reports and works by respected social scientists refuted many of these claims but academics were deeply stung. Some began to write about higher education from both traditionalist and liberal viewpoints. While their perspectives on pedagogy and politics were clearly at odds, academic traditionalists and liberals did not differ in their diagnosis of the effects of the postwar expansion of higher education. Both sides agreed that expansion had eroded the basis for intellectual community. As the disciplines had become more specialized, they argued, attention to establishing and maintaining connections among them had lapsed as faculties let the disciplines dominate the content of undergraduate education.

The traditionalists' response was to shore up standards and get rid of the remedials, minorities, older women, and government interference (Epstein, 1977). Yearning for an earlier, more innocent time when colleges were not mini-versities and universities were not multi-versities, they noted that government support was a two-edged sword. They urged a return to pre-World War II standards. A decline in support of higher education, in fact, might not be a bad thing because it provided the opportunity to simplify and get back to fundamentals. Drawing on earlier academic critics (Barzun, 1950; Nisbet, 1971; Hutchins, 1967) they argued that the crucial need for undergraduate education was coherence and discipline, and if that meant colleges and universities should get smaller, then smaller was better.

Liberals had their own solutions, based on their commitment to preserve the egalitarian gains of the last fifteen years. They agreed with traditionalists that the question of the quality of education was critical. Drawing on the findings of researchers like Astin (1968) and Chickering (1971) and their own experience teaching new students, they asserted that the people who benefitted from higher education as much, if not more, than students from privileged backgrounds should have the opportunity to get the best kind of education. They saw the new students as being just as worthy and as educable as the old students (Shor, 1980; Shaughnessy, 1977).

While they agreed that educational quality was the critical question, the traditionalists and liberals disagreed about what quality meant. For traditionalists, quality consisted of providing the very best instruction and educational environments to the most able students. For liberals, quality consisted of providing these benefits to the less able students as well. For the traditionalists, quality in the curriculum consisted of holding to the classics of the Western tradition, while liberals had a broader view of the subjects that could be taught with integrity.

Meanwhile, in the trenches, ordinary faculty were struggling with the new situation. Their first impulse was to go "back to basics". The 1970s saw a resurgence of English composition and mathematics requirements after their abandonment in many schools in the late 1960s and early 1970s. There was much talk about grade inflation. Faculties began to accept the necessity of teaching basic skills. This was true not only in "open door" schools but in elite ones as well. In the late 1970s books on writing, workshops for instructors, and projects on basic skills funded by foundations and federal agencies began to appear regularly (Shaughnessy, 1977; Elbow, 1973; Richardson, Martens and Fisk, 1981; Tobias, 1978).

In a few years, however, the loss of students from the liberal arts and their declining academic preparation led to a more fundamental examination of curriculum than back to basics. A national survey of faculty in the middle 1970s showed that half of them favored some sort of core curriculum (Levine, 1978). At faculty meetings in hundreds of colleges and universities across the country, an old question was being asked: "What should every educated person know?" (A few years earlier, faculties exploring competence-based education and other forms of "outcomes" education also asked "What should every educated person be able to do?" [Grant, et. al., 1979]). Specialists in different disciplines began talking with one another, often for the first time, about their fields and about why they cared about them. They complained to each other about the current generation of students--how practical they were, how compliant and unquestioning, now inarticulate. Many college and even more university faculties never got beyond this point. Some began to formulate a conception of liberal education for themselves, but now they did so from a very different perspective after thirty years of tumultuous change in American higher education. In the universities, people whose professional lives had been devoted primarily to research and graduate education had to talk to those who worked primarily with undergraduates. In almost all schools, faculty had to face the differences among their students.

The faculty included a substantial group who had been touched by the changes of the 1960s even if they had not been involved themselves in the educational innovations that had come in their wake. The effects of these innovations began to inform the mainstream (Martin, 1981). Faculties began to ask whether there were better ways to educate their students, especially those without the standard profile. They began to address the issue of different levels of preparation among their students, and some turned to some of the innovations of the 1970s they may have spurned earlier--like mastery learning, competence-based

education and new ways of teaching writing (Shaughnessy, 1977) and mathematics (Tobias, 1978). They asked, in particular, whether there might be ways the traditions of general and liberal education might be made more coherent and attractive to an increasingly practical student body.

Small colleges were more likely to make radical changes which covered the whole curriculum than large schools, particularly those with heavy investments in graduate programs and research, but even they began to examine the education they offered to their undergraduates. This was a painful process, as faculty members who themselves may not have had a liberal education discovered how narrow and ignorant not only their students, but they themselves, were.

Serious attempts were now being made to shore up liberal education. Stanford University restored courses in Western culture after dropping them a few years before. Pacific Lutheran University designed a core program consisting of eight courses and one seminar on the theme, "The Dynamics of Change." Carnegie-Mellon adopted a new core curriculum to give students experience with skills in several disciplines. Brooklyn College decided to require that all students take a basic core of ten courses, in an updated version of a core curriculum it had abandoned in the previous decade. Harvard, in a late but much celebrated move, introduced a core curriculum of sorts in 1978 (Shulman, 1978; Change, 1979).

Suddenly, general and liberal education had become a topic of general discussion. One could not pick up a newspaper or a thoughtful magazine without encountering some discussion of the liberal arts (Fiske, 1981). In a 1981 issue of Change, for example, a higher education magazine, the president of the University of Wisconsin system, Robert O'Neil, was reported to have appointed a commission to study the liberal arts (Schoenfeld, 1981). The American College Testing Service and the Educational Testing Service were working up tests to measure the outcomes of a liberal education. Major publishers of books on higher education were beginning to issue books on liberal education (Winter, McCelland, and Stewart, 1981; Kaplan, 1980; Brann, 1979; Schwab, 1978). The Carnegie Commission, after completing its work on national policies for higher education, turned to the undergraduate curriculum (Rudolph, 1977; Levine, 1978; Carnegie, 1977). Foundations and federal granting agencies like the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, increasingly alarmed by the serious flaws in the undergraduate curriculum, especially general and liberal education for non-elite students, sponsored a variety of projects in the late 1970s and early 1980s. The Rockefeller Foundation financed a conference on the liberal arts curriculum in 1978 and, almost simultaneously, a commission on the humanities chaired by the president of Stanford University, with members from academia, politics and industry (Commission on the Humanities, 1980).

Conferences on the undergraduate curriculum were organized regularly during this period by higher education associations such as the American Association for Higher Education and the Association of American Colleges, as well as foundations and universities. In 1981

alone, Bard College, SUNY/New Paltz, UCLA, Evergreen State, and SUNY/Stony Brook hosted major conferences. The Carnegie Foundation sponsored the "Colloquium on Common Learning" at the University of Chicago for faculty members and administrators from community colleges, small liberal arts colleges, state universities, and elite schools (Boyer and Levine, 1981). National Project IV, the project which provides the material for the rest of this paper, organized a national conference on liberal education a few months later, and attracted more than 300 faculty members and administrators from a variety of colleges and universities (2).

The interest in the undergraduate curriculum seems to be coming from all sectors of higher education. Harvard, Stanford and other major research universities have joined state colleges, small private liberal arts colleges, and community colleges in examining their undergraduate requirements (Gaff et. al., 1980). Older faculty who remember the Depression years are speaking with younger faculty who knew only the easy life of the 1960s. Traditionalists and innovators, humanists and scientists, teachers and administrators are meeting together. Educators with an interest in adapting the "soft" innovations of the 1960s (like cluster colleges and interdisciplinary curricula) to the 1980s are joining with those who talk about computers and competences.

Faculty motivations are diverse and often conflicting. Liberal arts faculty, especially in the humanities and the social sciences, are looking for ways to lure back students to their departments. Faculty who work with adults or poorly prepared students find themselves forced to think about what is fundamental in an undergraduate education. Faculty who encounter students whose lives or academic capacities do not match the assumptions underlying the organization and curricula of most colleges and universities find themselves being forced to think about what is fundamental in an undergraduate education. Those who work in interdisciplinary areas--Women's Studies, Ethnic Studies, American Culture and applied areas--human services, labor studies, communications--raise questions about the traditional content of the liberal arts. Administrators who want to resist the pressure coming from the shift in students' preference toward professional and vocational areas seek a good justification for maintaining support for the liberal arts. Politicians who have lost faith in the quality of higher education press for improvements, and spokespersons for the business world argue that a liberal education is more valuable for employees than a technical education (Beck, 1981).

PART II: THE VARIETIES OF GENERAL AND LIBERAL EDUCATION WITH SOME UNDERLYING COMMON PRINCIPLES

Argument

Networks of faculty and administrators whose primary identity is with undergraduate education have been growing in the last decade. National Project IV, "Examining the Varieties of Liberal Education" brought together representatives from a diverse group of colleges and universities to examine the conceptions and practices of liberal education from the perspective of their own programs. The fourteen programs represent a wide spectrum of institutions, student bodies, and curricular designs and, therefore, provide a reading on what is happening around the country in general and liberal education in the early 1980s. Despite the variations among them as well as among other general and liberal education efforts today, they are likely to emphasize the development of generic learning, such as critical thinking and synthesis. A review of the fourteen programs, in addition to some of the most advanced thinking about the curriculum, indicates that curricula that promote the development of generic learning tend to be guided by four major principles: (1) life sets the agenda for the content taught, which is (2) comprehensive in scope, (3) treated in a critical and reflective way, and (4) aims for integration.

In my travels to colleges and universities across the country, I have encountered many faculty members who are getting a new lease on life through teaching undergraduates and planning new curricula. While some are known in their disciplines, it is more difficult for them to gain recognition for their work as teachers and curriculum developers. In the past three or four years, however, they have become more visible in higher education circles through the efforts of higher education associations, granting agencies, publishers and informal networks. Despite the negative view of college teaching presented in the popular press, the reality is more encouraging. In college after college, typically but not exclusively the less elite schools, one finds small communities of faculty and students working on new approaches to learning: for example, the DOORS program at Illinois Central College which applies Piaget's theories to the teaching of reasoning in the disciplines; the competence-based approaches to liberal education at Alverno in Wisconsin, Sterling in Kansas, and Mars Hill in North Carolina; the freshman year programs at Clark College in Atlanta and the University of Nebraska's ADAPT program; integrated programs like QUEST, a two-year interdisciplinary investigation into western culture at Westminster College in Pennsylvania, and NEXA, a program that brings the sciences and humanities together at San Francisco State University.

Many are impelled by the desire to contrast the disciplines' approaches to similar problems--as at the Federated Learning Communities at SUNY-Stony Brook, which brings existing courses together in a cluster around a pressing contemporary problem like world hunger or technology and values--or by finding points of similarity, as Alverno and other competence-based programs do in their search for the generic competences, such as analytic ability, which underlie different disciplines. Others try to pursue the implications of "relevance", a term much bandied abut in the 1960s, by providing credit for prior learning, field experiences and internships, in an effort to help students connect what they are learning in classes with the real world.

Faculty in these programs take pride in the accomplishments of students from poor families, students with limited academic preparation, older students, and minorities--people who would not be expected to do well academically under normal circumstances. In the process of working with new sorts of students, faculty begin to learn, about computer simulation, learning theory, developmental psychology, testing, and curriculum theory. They become more conscious of themselves as educators.

National Project IV

The faculty members and administrators who participated in National Project IV between 1979 and 1981 were already either members of these networks of educators or became connected with them through their work with the project. They represent, therefore, the cutting edge of developments in general and liberal education curricula.

The project was one of several underwritten by the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education focused on the undergraduate curriculum (Hendrix and Stoel, 1981). "Examining the Varieties of Liberal Education," the subtitle of the project, required participants to articulate their conceptions of liberal education and to assess their practice. This they did in several ways: by conducting an evaluation of some aspect of their programs, by meeting with the other participants over two years for discussion and collaboration, and by reporting their findings to people within their own institutions and elsewhere. As project director, I draw heavily on the participants' reports, discussions, as well as interviews and observations on the fourteen campuses my staff and I made over the life of the project.

The Fourteen Programs at a Glance, which appears as Appendix A at the end of this paper, summarizes the major features of the institutions, the programs that were part of National Project IV if the whole institution was not included, and the design of their curricula. Appendix B summarizes characteristics of the fourteen institutions and Appendix C summarizes characteristics of the students.

The fourteen colleges and universities are a kind of geological cross-section of higher education. Two are community colleges, three are liberal arts colleges, and nine are comprehensive or research universities. They are divided equally between public and private

schools. Six have fewer than 2,500 students, six have between 2,500 and 10,000 students, and two have more than 20,000. Seven are located in the East, with an additional three in the Midwest and three in the South. Three rate themselves as having highly difficult entrance requirements, while five say they have "noncompetitive" requirements. The rest stand between these two extremes. Compared to the national distribution of colleges and universities, the fourteen as a group represent a cross-section of the public-private domains. They are somewhat more selective in their entrance requirements than most colleges and universities. They include significantly more universities and, therefore, larger student populations. And they are skewed toward the East Coast.

Their student populations cover a wide spectrum as well. Nine are directed to specific kinds of students: Hofstra's Labor Institute of Applied Social Science to union members; New York City Technical College's Institute of Study for Older Adults to retirees; Northern Virginia Community College at Manassas to under-prepared students in its Project Intertwine; Johnson State's External Degree Program, University of Nebraska-Lincoln's University Studies Program, University of Oklahoma's College of Liberal Studies, and Radcliffe's Seminars primarily to adult students; Talladega College to black students; and Northwestern's Program on Women to females. Some of these programs have high concentrations of students with other characteristics as well. The programs at Johnson State, Hofstra, New York City Technical College, and Radcliffe enroll a majority of women, while SUNY-Old Westbury and, again, Hofstra attract a large proportion of black students.

Four of the programs(3) fit what is now a declining sector--the predominantly white, coeducational institution with a fairly equal number of men and women between 18 and 22, of average to above average academic preparation. These four are Saint Joseph's College, SUNY-Stony Brook, Brooklyn and Hampshire College. Overall, students in the fourteen programs are somewhat older than the student population nationally (30.6 vs. 22.5) and have a higher percentage of females (63% vs. 51%) and blacks (28% vs. 13%). However, the institutions in which the programs are located approach the national averages on the age, sex and minority status of their student bodies.

There is even more diversity in the curricula of the fourteen programs. Of the fourteen, eleven are programs located within larger institutions, while three are a total institutions. Of the eleven programs, eight are permitted to offer students opportunities to meet some or all requirements toward graduation. Some do this by letting students, typically adults, design their own graduation plans according to guidelines enforced by faculty advisors or mentors. The College of Liberal Studies at the University of Oklahoma, the University Studies program at the University of Nebraska, and the External Degree Program at Johnson State College in Vermont are examples of this approach. Others offer certain courses that partially meet their institutions' graduation requirements, while some offer a whole curriculum which coexists with the

existing general education or baccalaureate curricula at their institutions.

Table 1 summarizes the most important features of what the fourteen programs teach. No two teach the same subjects. Six provide specific instruction in the basic skills of writing, reading and mathematics in addition to or in conjunction with subject-matter courses. Five programs teach a limited number of courses, while nine cover the whole range of the disciplines for general education or the whole undergraduate curriculum. Among the three curricula representing total institutions--Hampshire, Saint Joseph's and Talladega--only Saint Joseph's insists that all students take exactly the same courses to meet its general education exit requirements. Hampshire allows students to design an individualized way to meet its graduation requirements. Talladega's distribution system combines survey courses with departmental courses.

Several of the programs within larger institutions which have distribution requirements narrow the range of choice for students. In addition, they present a unique educational rationale and environment to their students. In some cases, as with the now-discontinued program at Brooklyn College, they prescribe a whole course of study--in effect, a core curriculum at the program rather than institutional level. But since they do not encompass the whole student body, they offer one option among several from which students may choose to meet their general education requirements.

The idea of a series of core curricula, usually crossing the disciplines or combining them in new ways, has become popular in recent years. Indeed, when Brooklyn College disbanded the new School of Liberal Arts, one of the reasons given was that the college would institute a series of core curricula. Other special programs may not cover all general education requirements, but they typically (if they want enough students!) work out equivalencies for existing requirements. Again, they tend to combine the disciplines in new ways, either around a problem or a set of generic skills. Thus, for example, students enrolled in the SUNY-Stony Brook program may choose it as an alternative way to satisfy some departmental requirements by taking a cluster of courses from different disciplines related to a common theme. In the ADAPT program at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, specifically coordinated courses and humanities count toward the required general education distribution at the university. At Bowling Green State University, freshmen may enroll in the Little College, which meets some of the institution's distribution requirements by teaching the "generic skills" of analysis, values assessment, and problem-solving rather than discipline-based courses.

The existence of a variety of general/liberal education programs provides more, rather than less, coherence than the typical distribution system by substituting programmatic choice for individual choice. In the process, students probably get a more coherent education, faculty are challenged by having to work with colleagues from different disciplines, and both groups are likely to develop a greater sense of intellectual community. I strongly advocate this approach to general education and

take my rationale both from the recent attempts to improve the content and quality of undergraduate education and as well as from the clear benefits of small learning communities (Brann, 1979; Feldman and Newcomb, 1969; Smith and Bernstein, 1979; Astin, 1977; Heath, 1977).

For a more vivid sense of the varieties of approaches to these questions, I present three programs from National Project IV: An individualized program for older students of average preparation at Johnson State College; a core curriculum for younger students of average preparation at Saint Joseph's College; and an individualized examination system for younger well-prepared students at Hampshire College.

An Individualized Program. The External Degree Program (EDP) joined Johnson State College, one of the five colleges in the Vermont State College system, in 1980. Just about that time, Johnson State was beginning to examine its distribution requirements and the State College trustees were discussing a set of core requirements for the state system. While the recent incorporation of EDP into Johnson State precludes much influence from the program on the institution, its presence indicates Johnson State's recognition of the importance of adult students.

EDP is well-adapted to its primarily rural adult population. Almost all of the students are over 25; their mean age is 38. More than half have full-time jobs. Three-quarters are women, the majority of whom have dependent children. Students' occupations and majors cluster primarily in education, business, and human services. The program serves close to 200 students who live all over the state, many in areas that are not within easy commuting distance of any of the campuses in the state system. EDP is an upper division program, and only students who have completed 60 credits of college work, either through courses or through the assessment of prior learning, are accepted. Students in EDP complete 122 credits required for the Bachelor's degree by taking extension courses, weekend courses offered by Johnson State College, or courses on campuses near their homes. They may also conduct carefully planned independent studies, tutorials, internships and practice. With help from a "mentor", each student builds a personal, hand-tailored program which is spelled out in a "learning contract" each term and in an overall degree plan. These plans must include 40 upper level credits, 30 in a concentration and 24 in an upper level concentration. A full 60 credits must be in liberal studies.

The main problem for EDP, as for most individualized programs, is to reach consensus on what counts as meeting program requirements, particularly in liberal studies. Students in the Vermont program are like students everywhere, perhaps even more so: They "want that piece of paper", mostly to improve their earning power and occupational choice. This is not a group, therefore, that is easily convinced to take 60 credits in liberal arts subjects, and mentors find themselves arguing with students about what should meet the program's requirements. This is a sticky question under the best of circumstances. But in a campus-free program like EDP, centrifugal force alone can destroy any particular

answer. EDP has had a difficult time balancing its emphasis on flexibility with its equally strong emphasis on liberal learning. Like Empire State College in New York state on which it was modelled, the individualized contract, personal relationships between mentors and students, and the dispersion of students encourage responsiveness to students' needs. But students do not always know what they need; even if they do, what they say they need may not be what the institution is willing to give. Requirements are a way to regulate the potential anarchy in such a system but they are effective only if those who represent the institution--in EDP's case, the mentors--interpret them in fairly similar ways. Like faculty in traditional institutions, the mentors are given some latitude in how they carry out their work. Differences among them in their interpretation of the program's requirements, therefore, are inevitable.

Despite these differences, the mentors do manage to reach rough agreement on what constitutes a good education in EDP. How? It is clearly not because of the requirements they work with, since they can interpret them quite differently. Rather, it comes from a fervent belief in the necessity of a certain kind of liberal education that is grounded in an understanding of students' lives. For EDP, liberal education shows students the way to lead more enlightened lives and increases their "capacity to engage productively with a changing environment" (Daloz, 1981, p. 10). The EDP students come to their studies with some history--they are not empty vessels to be filled. Many are ready to assess their lives, sometimes at high personal risk. Liberal education in EDP's view consists, therefore, not in the courses students take or the skills they learn but in the way what they learn affects their lives. It is "the process of making new sense of the world--a process of transformation" (Daloz, 1981, p. 58).

How does this happen? All aspects of the program--the courses, the clusters of students from the same geographic region who meet several times during a term, the mentors--are judged for their potential to stimulate higher levels of intellectual, ethical and ego development. The notion of development is canon, evidence, justification for the EDP program. Drawing on a growing fund of research on life-cycle development, especially the work of William Perry (1970) on intellectual development and Jane Loevinger (1976) on ego development, this "developmental perspective" attempts to explicate the conditions under which people move through stages from "stereotyped thinking and simplistic conceptualization toward a progressively differentiated and integrated world view" (Daloz, 1981, p. 11.). The developmental perspective has begun to influence writing on higher education (Chickering, 1981), as well as groups of teachers and researchers around the country who are beginning to translate findings on life-cycle development into curricular designs and teaching practices (Greenberg, 1980; Kneflekamp, 1978; Weathersby and Tarule, 1980; Armstrong, 1981). EDP is part of this effort and has drawn some attention for it.

A Required Core Curriculum. Saint Joseph's College is a small (1000 students), private residential college of Roman Catholic origins located

in the small town of Rensselaer, Indiana 75 miles southeast of Chicago. Like many small colleges, Saint Joseph's is extremely vulnerable to economic and demographic changes. It is, therefore, extraordinary that it should have come up with and taught for the past twelve years one of the most interesting liberal education curricula to be found anywhere in this country. Core, as it is called, is an ordered series of ten courses totalling 45 credits which are required of all students at the college. Rather than being slotted into the first two years, a common practice at other schools which has the effect of isolating general education from the major, Core runs through the eight undergraduate semesters intertwined with the major. The courses in Core are thematic rather than disciplinary, although they use materials and approaches from several disciplines. Core is integrative in attempting to articulate the ten courses with one another and with a common rationale. The central rationale for Core is its focus on the human condition, within a tradition of humanistic Christianity. It holds six main objectives:

1) To develop cognitive and communication skills;
2) To build a community of common seekers after truth;
3) To expand awareness of the many dimensions of reality;
4) To develop students' values;
5) To witness to specific Christian values.

The sequencing of courses is deliberate. It follows the metaphor of the funnel, with the narrow end at the beginning. "The Contemporary World" asks students to place themselves in the context of the twentieth century; they start by trying to understand what life must have been like in the early part of this century for their grandparents in their youth. Through novels, history, philosophy, theology, the natural and social sciences, Core 1 tries to come to terms with the major themes of the twentieth century. From there, Core 2, "The Roots of Western Civilization", Core 3, "The Christian Impact on the West", and Core 4, "The Modern World", investigate the historical roots of contemporary ideas and institutions. In the junior year, while students take a science sequence in Cores 5 and 6 called "Man in the Universe", they are also asked to compare the "story of humans as told by science in Western culture with the alternative views of man in non-Western cultures presented in Cores 7 and 8, "Non-Western Studies", which are taken concurrently. Core 9 returns to the contemporary world in "Toward a Christian Humanism", which explores the nature of man, religion and Christian faith. Core 10, "Christianity and the Human Condition", is intended to help students make a "practical synthesis" through a capstone investigation of dimensions of topics closely connected to their majors such as respect for life, faith and reason, and the ethics of economic development.

Each course in Core is divided equally into large lecture sessions and small discussion groups. Faculty members usually lecture in their fields of expertise but they are often called upon to discuss readings and topics outside of their fields in the discussion classes. This makes some feel uncomfortable about dispensing knowledge about subjects outside of their fields of specialization, and many have had to find a new definition

of their role as teacher. The college has had a hard time coming up with the right name for this new role. While they have been calling it "co-learner", most people at the college, including students, do not like the equality and laxness it implies. Whatever it is called, teaching in Core has required faculty to learn material they may not have encountered before. This has been a humbling experience for some instructors. As one of them put it, "Fifteen years ago I was king of the mountain. Now I have to listen to my colleagues." Core has been, in effect, a vehicle for faculty development. Since 60% of the faculty at the college teach in Core, this is no small matter.

At a time when other schools around the country were throwing out their requirements, Core was bringing them back in. The story of how this happened is too long to tell here. Suffice to say that it entailed what one faculty member called "radical surgery" of an old and comfortable distribution system. Drawing its main inspiration from the renewed vision of the Church and community in the Second Vatical Council, people at Saint Joseph's asked themselves what being an institution affiliated with the Catholic Church implied. They asked what intellectual community meant and reached the conclusion that

> community is not only a legitimate goal for higher education but a necessary goal. Liberal education aims to define the human in larger than male white, middle class, American midwestern terms.(4)

Everything at the college is turned to the end of creating a common community of student and faculty learners in the search to understand what it means to be human. It is crucial that this occurs within the themes and structures created by Core, which require great interdependence among students, among faculty, and between students and faculty. No one could go completely his own way any more.

And what about the students? As conventional thinking would have it, they are a bunch unlikely to be drawn to investigations of the human condition. Middle-Americans, fresh-faced, unquestioning, traditional, rather ethnocentric, not especially talented "good kids" from Middle America. Most of Saint Joseph's students are not overwhelmingly interested in the higher professions or graduate schools. They want to get their degrees, find a good job and grow up.

These students are the college's true mission. Faculty at Saint Joseph's rarely complain about the students or wish they had different ones, as faculty often do at other colleges. They are not out to uproot or humiliate them. Rather, they want their students to realize that there is something more spacious than their families and the general culture have taught them to want. One faculty member said of the students that they "come to college having been conditioned to get ahead. We try to make life worth living." Another said

> it's not the subject . . . it's the blooming student who counts. You have to give them the freedom from being tied to a job and TV, freedom from their little persons(5).

There is strong evidence, which I will present later, that a large number of students respond to Core in its terms (Nichols, 1981). If that is so, then Saint Joseph's holds hope for higher education in the 1980s. It tells us that a middling student body of no particular luster can reflect on the most significant questions facing humankind. It tells us as well that this can be done in an integrative and thematic way without sacrificing academic quality and depth.

An Individualized Prescribed Curriculum. Hampshire College is a small (1200 students) private liberal arts college which was founded in 1970 after many years of planning (Patterson and Longworth, 1966). It has a structure that challenges many of the accepted practices in U.S. higher education. Instead of standing completely independently, like most liberal arts colleges of its size and resources, it shares courses and activities with four other colleges in its immediate vicinity: Amherst, Mt. Holyoke, Smith and the University of Massachusetts. Instead of traditional disciplinary departments, it brings together several disciplines into four schools according to their characteristic modes of inquiry: Humanities and Arts, Natural Sciences, Social Sciences, Language and Communication. Instead of toting up course credits for graduation, students are required to complete projects and papers on topics of their choice. And instead of letter grades students receive detailed evaluation of their performance.

Liberal education at Hampshire proceeds through three "divisions", which are essentially graduation requirements. Division I is a breadth requirement that has students ask a significant question and then answer it by means of the different frameworks and methods in the four schools. In order to pass Division I students must complete projects and papers in each school. Division II, the equivalent of a major, requires students to build depth in one area through whatever means are appropriate--courses, field work, papers, independent studies. To pass Division II, students take a comprehensive examination, usually oral, based on course evaluations, papers, projects, and a proposal for Division III. In Division III, students complete a major research project or artistic work in their Division II area. They also must become engaged in some community service project and enroll in an integrative seminar with students from other fields. In the first two divisions, students design an individual program and examination with a faculty committee; the Division III paper or project also requires that a written contract be worked out with a faculty committee.

How does this system work in practice? The first important point about Hampshire is that it places much more weight on questions than answers. Students are encouraged to do what professionals do: work out problems, comb the literature, try different solutions. In separating evaluation from performance in courses, Hampshire frees its faculty to join with students to beat the problems they are wrestling with without

worrying about playing favorites or interfering with the objectivity of their grading(6). Hampshire students talk about "working with" rather than "taking a course with" certain faculty members. They spend a lot of time with the faculty identifying problems, clarifying questions, experimenting with solutions, designing ways to test answers, reviewing findings, and critiquing papers. Obviously there are differences in style among the schools and individual faculty members but the faculty at Hampshire must, at minimum, treat students as intelligent and responsible people capable of doing serious intellectual work.

The Hampshire program runs the danger of encouraging premature specialization, and certainly there are students who narrow their interests too soon. This tendency is counteracted partly by the Division I requirement and partly by the interdisciplinary structure of the college. Neither of these features would be enough, however, without a third important aspect of the way Hampshire works: the emphasis on paying attention to the learning process itself. Students are pushed constantly to develop the general art of inquiry in all areas of their lives. They are encouraged to "learn how to learn" and watch as they are doing it (Bateson, 1974; Perry, 1970). As several students put it: "If there's any topic I'm interested in, I can track it down." "I'm aware that the world has more to teach." "I can accomplish a lot if I study what I'm interested in carefully." "Knowledge is no longer a textbook. I am free to pick out what I need"(7).

The Hampshire program, then, combines clearly defined ends for liberal education with what appear to be undefined means for reaching those ends, the opposite of what most colleges and universities do, which is to tell students what they must do but not why. Students at Hampshire seem to accept the ends but they struggle constantly with the ambiguity and unrelenting freedom of means. Many succumb to a disease known as "Hampshire Drift". Students complain about feeling harried much of the time, never knowing when they are finished, always pushing themselves on to questions they know are lurking under any particular answer they may come up with. They become, in a word, academics.

Four Guiding Principles for General and Liberal Education

There has not been a standard liberal or general education curriculum shared by all colleges and universities since what has been taught has depended on student markets and local contexts (Blackburn, 1981). The three programs described in the last section, and the eleven others in National Project IV, all teach different things. The variation among them, however, is reduced considerably if we look at the form of their curricula and the principles underlying them. First, almost all have curricula in which general education and work in a pre-professional or disciplinary major occur side by side. Second, they do not define what they do exclusively in terms of specific subjects or disciplinary terrains. Rather, they approach content in terms of the extent to which it contributes to the development of certain capacities and qualities in their students.

Which capacities and qualities are to be fostered varies from school to school: Saint Joseph's Christian tradition emphasizes ethical principles more than the two secular schools, for example. They are all directed, as well, to developing high-level intellectual functioning on the part of their students. How "high" and what counts as "intellectual functioning" differs. Clearly, the intellectual autonomy and self-discipline required at Hampshire are much greater than at the other two schools. But the capacity to think critically about family origins and personal histories is challenged more at Saint Joseph's and Johnson State. Other schools will have other emphases. The important point here is that they are part of a widespread effort to define a curriculum in terms of what is called "generic" learning, learning that students can apply in a variety of circumstances, not only in college courses (Woditsch, 1977; Winter, McClelland and Stewart, 1981; Grant et. al., 1979, Value-Added, 1977).

What kind of curriculum promotes the development of such generic capacities(8)? It appears to be a curriculum that allows students to draw on experience, that is comprehensive, integrated and critical. Many of the programs in National Project IV illustrate these four principles (Nichols, forthcoming).

Principle 1: Life sets the agenda. The point here is that the curriculum is not set by "what is 'interesting' to some one or group of disciplines but first and foremost by who students and teachers are" (Nichols, 1982, p. 15). Some of the programs draw on the particular experiences of their students, especially if they belong to a special group (women, working class, blacks), while others start with the experience of a more diverse group. Nichols points out that what matters is not so much whose experience is being scrutinized but, rather, what questions are asked about them: Who they are, what they have experienced, what they want to be or become.

Thus, for example, the Program on Women at Northwestern University, like other Women's Studies programs, starts with an analysis of the roles women play in this and other societies. It takes seriously the lived experience of both men and women students and then tries to move them beyond their particular experiences to an understanding formed by history, the social and behavioral sciences, and the humanities. Another example is provided by the Stony Brook program, where contemporary issues of broad human significance, such as world hunger, technology and values, or cities, are the basis for a federation of existing courses. Or take Saint Joseph's College, which begins the first semester of Core with the question: "Who am I as a man or woman in twentieth century America?" Later semesters then expand this question by looking at the historical roots of shared institutions and values. In a curriculum that is very different in scope and content, the African-American Music and Dance programs at SUNY-Old Westbury, we can see the same principle operate. That program begins with improvisation. After that, students are taught composition and theory, as well as being exposed to materials from other disciplines relevant to African-American music.

In other words, these programs stand on an experiential ground, in contrast to most undergraduate curricula which are based on the disciplines' definitions of what is important. Being grounded in the experience of real people does not mean that they stop with those experiences. As we have seen, starting with lived experience larger worlds, including those of the disciplines.

Principle 2: Comprehensive. The scope of general and liberal education is comprehensive. It goes beyond the boundaries of any department, discipline or group of people. Thoughtful commentators are led, apparently inexorably, to talk of new ways to combine the disciplines to reach a more comprehensive understanding (Boyer and Levine, 1981; Brann, 1979; Brubacher, 1977; Conrad and Wyer, 1980; Halliburton, 1977; Bowen, 1977; Hirst, 1974). In practice, this means bringing faculty together from different disciplines, which many of the fourteen programs do in a variety of ways.

Principle 3: Critical. Most programs see liberal education as requiring that they challenge what is taken for granted, that assumptions in the culture, including the culture of the academy, must be examined and made explicit: "the invisible becomes visible", as one of them put it. For women, blacks, working class people, this means challenging assumptions exclusively based on the experience of males, or whites, or middle-class people. An important impact of a critical mode of education which we will see reflected in students' comments reported later in this paper, is the extent to which they become more aware of the process of socialization they have been through and the way the culture and particular institutions have shaped their ideas, beliefs and values. What were taken as givens, necessities even, can now be viewed with critical reflection. This critical reflection then opens up new possibilities for students.

Principle 4: Integrated. Most of the programs in National Project IV have what Cardinal Newman called a "connected" view. This takes place on several levels and in several ways. At the first level is the attempt to integrate the separate views of the disciplines. There is also the integration of the objective and the subjective, with the acceptance of both realms of experience as legitimate. Many people in the fourteen programs also speak of integrating the academic and the personal. They emphasize the growth of a personal value system as an important outcome of liberal education for their students, as well as enhanced self-esteem and an appreciation for one's roots. Finally, many attempt to integrate these individual outcomes with the development of a sense of community.

To what extent do these principles apply to other general and liberal education curricula? They do not represent the average approach, particularly distribution systems which have been criticized precisely because they lack integration and a critical point of view (Gaff, n.d.). If the four principles do not apply to the average curriculum, they do represent the cutting edge of thinking and practice in general and liberal education today. The "invisible college" of education theorists and innovators in higher education is likely to draw on them. In preparing

this section, I reached into the files I have gathered over the last three years for National Project IV as illustrations:

Bloomfield College in New Jersey teaches poorly-prepared, vocationally minded students analytical thinking in an Interdisciplinary Core Program that combines mathematics, natural science, social sciences, humanities, and communications. Course work is integrated with systematic diagnosis and testing through a Learning Support Workshop and optional Life Planning Seminars. The program, almost ten years old, increased faculty collaboration (Sadler, 1979).

Antioch College in Ohio, with a selective free-wheeling student body, divides its proposed general education curriculum into knowledge areas (e.g., Western Culture, Non-Western Culture, Social Environment, Individual Development, Living Environment, Physical Environment, Mathematical Concepts) and skills (Aesthetic-Creative, Analytical-Integrative, Experimental, Information Retrieval, Intercultural, Interpersonal, Linguistic, Quantitative, Valuing). Courses are designated according to which knowledge and skill areas they address, with the approval of the college curriculum committee. Co-op jobs and community activities can be applied to skill requirements (Antioch College, n.d.).

Miami-Dade Community College's Intercurricular Studies Division, with a heterogeneous student population, teaches interdisciplinary modules with an interdependent complement of four instructors and 145 students who voluntarily enroll in the division for a minimum of four courses. Courses in the modules are the same as those taught in departments at the institution, with the additional expectation that students apply what they learn to their own lives and to the world in which they live (Wiley, n.d.).

University of Massachusetts - Boston's College for Public and Community Service primarily enrolls working adults. In its General Education Center, students must demonstrate a minimum of eight competencies at each of two levels, as well as four elective competencies at either level. The competencies fall into three areas: self-assessment (e.g., observe/describe human interaction, cultural awareness, taking a stand), criticism/argument (e.g., analyzing arguments, using a theory), applying a discipline area (e.g., doing history, economic literacy). (College for Public and Community Service, 1980).

John Nichols forthcoming reviewed a major recent work on higher education to see if it reflected the four principles. The Modern American College (Chickering, 1981) contains chapters on changes in the teaching of particular disciplines and professions, especially in the light of changes in student characteristics. These chapters provide countless of examples of the operation of one or more of the four principles. Some examples:

Life sets the agenda With more adults in classes, teachers of writing have learned that they will get better work if they encourage students to draw on their own experience. The author of the chapter on

economics suggests that more attention to personal economic decision-making be included in the economics curriculum. The biologist suggests incorporating the key principles of biology with life and death, as well as more mundane daily concerns.

Comprehensive Several of the authors write of making their disciplines more comprehensive, primarily by opening them to more interdisciplinary ventures. Some complain that subjects typically considered to be part of the liberal arts have become too narrow and specialized. The authors of the chapters on business administration and the human services advocate educating generalists in their professions.

Critical Many of the authors, while advocating the experiential grounding of a liberal education, also express the need to make students critical of their own experience. This issue comes up especially when older students are discussed. The chapter by an anthropologist emphasizes the critical self-reflection that follows from studying other cultures, the ability to shift perspective and to understand life from another's point of view.

Integrated Most of the authors plead for more integration within their disciplines and across the disciplines. Adults, especially, are seen as naturally disposed to integrative studies. But even younger students are in great need of an integrated understanding, which makes a critical contribution to student growth and development.

While he finds encouragement from these authors, Nichols insists that general and liberal education must operate with all four principles. Since the content of the disciplines has become more diverse and complex--and therefore can be more flexible in what is taught--the way content is organized and presented can take a variety of forms. Liberal and general education curricula must "take all of human experience seriously and try to make sense of it in a critical and holistic way (Nichols, forthcoming, p. 27). This is possible and, in fact, is being practiced not only in several of the programs in National Project IV but in other schools that are leading in the reformulation of the undergraduate curriculum. This has come about because they operate in contexts that encourage, occasionally force, them to do so. It is to the question of how context shapes content that we now turn.

PART III: THE CONTEXT OF CONTENT AND INTELLECTUAL COMMUNITIES

Argument

Because a curriculum is a collective product that touches on the political economy of institutions, it is very difficult to change. Particular curricula depend very much on their contexts. Many of the programs in National Project IV are tied to their institutions in specific ways. They are more integrated into the mainstream than innovations in the recent past. Internally, they are lively intellectual communities in which faculty work together and students are respected members. They are, therefore, likely to contribute to the revitalization of the faculty as well as to the education of their students.

A curriculum is a powerful symbol. It tells faculty how important their fields are and it tells students what the faculty as a corporate body considers important to study. If it is distinctive, a curriculum endows a college with a special mystique that helps attract students and money. A curriculum is also a kind of economy. It channels students to some courses and not to others; it affects enrollments and, therefore, which departments and courses have a legitimate call on institutional resources.

A curriculum, therefore, is the collective expression not simply of an institution's beliefs about knowledge but also about its political economy (Conrad, 1978). Changes in a curriculum, unlike changes in a course, require collective action and coordination. Any curricular change is likely to be controversial, and faculty would just as soon avoid conflicts. Little wonder, then, that changing the curriculum has been likened to moving a cemetery. Because a curriculum is a collective product, it is very dependent in its substance and form on the setting in which it is framed. Again, in contrast to the individual course, whose instructor's choice of subject matter and teaching materials is relatively free, a curriculum is highly constrained by context.

We must look at the way context affects general and liberal education because there is not a clear place for them, no organizational space that naturally encourages the practice of general and liberal education. Boyer and Levine (1980), in their recent critique of general education, use the metaphor of the "spare room." General education has occupied the spare room of higher education. It has been a guest, a shabby guest who has been shuffled from the main part of the house.

If general and liberal education of the sort this paper describes is to become a regular inhabitant in the house of academe, it must be given a proper room in the center of the house with all the proper amenities. This does not mean that it needs to occupy all the rooms, or that the whole house need be done over to accommodate it. This is easier said than done, especially when there is little money around to build additions. This section examines the ways the fourteen programs have been accommodated within their respective houses. It will discuss

this question by looking at organizational structure, curricular structure, and characteristics of the faculty.

Organizational Structures

We saw earlier that the curricula apply to all students at three of the schools in National Project IV--Talladega, Hampshire and Saint Joseph's--while the rest served less than the full student bodies at their institutions. How are these programs organized and placed within their institutions? The majority are programs without departmental status, although most draw on departments for advice and teachers. Only one was a separate college --the New School of Liberal Arts at Brooklyn College-- and this was disbanded because it had become too isolated from Brooklyn College as a whole to withstand the pressures of the 1980's (Black, 1981). All the others are either located in existing departments or colleges. All but Brooklyn College use at least some faculty from existing departments as teachers or advisors and, while most of them are looked on as unique because of the students they serve or their curricular designs, the continuation of most does not seem to be in question in 1982.

There are good reasons for the relative stability of many of these programs, which are analyzed in detail by Michael Mills (1982). He attributes their stability to three major factors: (1) a capacity to build ties to existing, stable units within their institutions, (2) the presence of a visible leader who articulates their mission, (3) and the development of a core group of faculty willing to go out of their way to defend and protect the program. The programs, in other words, have learned how to insinuate themselves into their institutions. With the exception of the Brooklyn program, they are not separatist affairs relegated to the margins. Some, in fact, are located squarely in the mainstream. Others may not be of the mainstream but they occupy a tributary that is connected to the mainstream. Or to use another image: they are woven into the fabric of their institutions. They may challenge many of the assumptions and practices of their institutions but they do this as a loyal opposition.

How they do this varies according to the nature of their institutions: For research-oriented schools like Stony Brook, Nebraska, Northwestern, and Oklahoma, the programs build ties to the disciplinary departments--at the Stony Brook and Northwestern programs by actually incorporating regular departmental courses into their curricula, at Oklahoma and Nebraska by drawing on departmental faculty as advisors and teachers. For schools with a primary commitment to a particular student group, teaching them according to standards the rest of their institutions can respect provides some measure of legitimacy. Thus, the fact that the African-American Music Program at Old Westbury is open to all students, and not just those with musical backgrounds, expresses Old Westbury's commitment to an open admissions policy. Core at Saint Joseph's College appeals to the commitment on the part of many of the faculty to Christian humanism. EDP at Johnson State appeals to the institution's need to serve students of all ages.

This is not to say that the present is effortless or that the future is guaranteed. Like alternative organizations, the programs struggle constantly with the context in which they operate. At the very least, they fight against losing their distinctiveness in the struggle to survive. Thus, for example, Northwestern University's Program on Women on the one hand must convince departments to offer more courses related to women's studies, while at the same time resisting the assumptions and behaviors at an institution that has been uncomfortable with women. The program at Hofstra must convince faculty colleagues that what they are teaching is acadmemically respectable, while at the same time resisting pressure to conventionalize the labor studies curriculum.

One of the main lessons of the reforms of the past fifteen years is the vulnerability of the "enclave" approach. With the availability of outside resources and/or a social movement to support them, it was relatively easy to start new programs, departments and colleges in the late 1960s and the early 1970s. Typically viewed as illegitimate and even deviant by the mainstream, such separate units quickly formed a counter-identity. But since they lacked ties to the mainstream, such enclaves were vulnerable as the competition for money quickened later in the 1970s.

Curriculum reformers are much more likely now to come from and work within the mainstream of their institutions. They have worked out a variety of ways to influence the mainstream (Wittig, 1980; Wee, 1981): appointing general education "czars", administrators who look after the general education curriculum; forming new centralized structures for the general education curriculum; constituting college-wide committees to formulate criteria, review courses, and evaluate programs; starting special programs with formal linkages to the mainstream to prevent enclaving; and making sure there are regular reviews of the undergraduate curriculum. For interdisciplinary programs like Women's Studies and Black Studies, there has been a trend in the past five years to build formal linkages to regular departments.

Curricular Structures

With the exception of Talladega, all fourteen programs have curricular and teaching arrangements that are unusual in higher education, from highly structured requirements and sequences of courses (Saint Joseph's, Brooklyn, Stony Brook) to individualized arrangements (Johnson State, Nebraska, Oklahoma). Several --Hofstra, Johnson State, New York City Technical College, and Oklahoma-- bring education to their students and operate with unusual time schedules. Brooklyn's four-hour block classes, Johnson State's clusters, and Oklahoma's inter-area campus seminars, are all unusual attempts to intensify the undergraduate experience, particularly for commuting and geographically dispersed students. Six have special faculty roles --the mentor at EDP, the faculty advisor at Nebraska and Oklahoma, the counselor-instructor at Northern Virginia, the faculty co-learner at Saint Joseph's, the "master learner" at Stony Brook.

Despite differences in design, all fourteen approaches have in common an emphasis on interaction and exchange, small classes (though not exclusively so --several combine large lectures with small classes),

and face-to-face communication. Even the individualized programs reach for a social expression of ideas. This emphasis on interaction is not limited to the vagaries of informal socializing or a collegiate environment. Rather, it is built into educational structures. This means that the talk that goes on is likely to be focused on subjects that arise in courses. Students and a surprising number of faculty discover how invigorating it is to engage in intellectual discourse. Many of them experience, in other words, the meaning of academic community. In many ways they resemble the kinds of intellectual communities that grow up informally in some first-rate residential liberal arts colleges like Swarthmore and Oberlin, schools that are well-known for their powerful impact on their students (Feldman and Newcomb, 1969; Astin, 1977; Chickering, 1974). Several of the programs in National Project IV embody in their structures the conditions recommended by recent commentators on secondary and higher education for the kind of self-governing, cooperative intellectual community that promotes the growth and self-reliance of students and teachers (Heath, 1977; Torbert, 1978; Hill, 1981; Newmann, 1981; Kohlberg, 1980; Johnson, 1981).

In a daily way, then, and often in less than ideal circumstances, students and faculty in the National Project IV programs live in worlds that allow them to experience reasoned discourse about questions that matter. For many thoughtful commentators on liberal education, from Socrates to Schwab, this is the beginning and end of education (Schwab, 1978; Brann, 1979; Wegener, 1978).

One of the lessons to be learned from National Project IV is that it doesn't take a lot of money to build such communities of learning, nor does it require a residential institution. Rather, attention to how the curriculum is structured to affect social relationships is critical. One important component of community is the provision of facilities for students and faculty to get together outside of class, preferably near classrooms. This is more important for commuter institutions than for residential ones, where opportunities for informal interaction are built into the physical layout and rhythm of daily life. The four-hour class blocks at Brooklyn College required that classes take breaks and these were times when students could talk informally with one another or with their teachers in a modest coffee lounge located near classes and faculty offices. In the Johnson State program, the geographically-based clusters and meetings with mentors encourage such encounters. The program at Oklahoma, by bringing its students scattered across the country to the Norman campus for short seminars, encourages intense bouts of interaction. The program at Stony Brook has its own lounge in the science building where it is located, and it is perhaps significant for community building that it had to fight for the space and scrounge for the furniture.

The most striking feature of many of these programs --at least ten-- is the extent to which faculty coordinate with one another in their teaching and students participate in the curriculum in some way other than taking courses. This is very unusual in U.S. higher

education, where faculty generally teach their classes in isolation from one another and rarely talk with one another about teaching. A few examples: At Brooklyn College, faculty teaching in the same historical period in the New School of Liberal Arts were forced to coordinate with one another because they all taught pretty much the same students. Faculty at Hampshire get together to decide whether students have met divisional requirements. Northern Virginia's Project Interwine requires that counselors meet regularly with teachers to compare their assessments of student progress. Those teaching in the Stony Brook program participate in a special planning seminar before the term in which they teach and meet in a seminar during the term. Faculty teaching in Core at Saint Joseph's plan the sequence of readings yearly. The result of such encounters is often "anguished" and "exasperated", as one of the faculty members at Saint Joseph's put it:

> I don't plan a CORE course all alone; I have to do it in anguished and exasperated dialogue with a whole set of other prima donnas who are just as pin-headed as I am in virtue of their training, except that they have other "specialities" (Black and Mills, forthcoming, p.1).

The students participate in new ways as well. At Hofstra students sit on a governing council for the program, which considers curricular matters as well as other issues. At New York City Technical College, potential students at the centers for the elderly where the courses are taught vote on the courses they want taught. At Saint Joseph's College, student representatives are required to be members of the Core planning committee. At Stony Brook , students increasingly take responsibility for running an integrative seminar.

Minimizing, but not eliminating, status (not authority) differences between students and faculty is one important feature of such communities. Doing this structurally --by having faculty teach either outside of their disciplines entirely or by forcing them to apply their disciplines to real situations -- as at Saint Joseph's, Brooklyn, Hampshire, Vermont, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Hofstra, Johnson State, Stony Brook-- makes the faculty more humble and willing to learn. As one of the teachers at Saint Joseph's put it:

> In the old days, as lecturer-teacher of "my" students, I was virtually not answerable to anyone BUT my students for either what I taught or for how I taught it in MY classes. I tended to be the big answer for them --sole arbiter of truth in content and justice in grading. We just didn't talk all that much with one another, and I surely didn't listen all that much to them. CORE really tends to explode all that....In discussion groups, I HAVE to listen to my students, and they to one another as well as to me, as we wrestle with the content. And not infrequently, one or the other of them knows a LOT more about the topic under discussion than I do. Yet I have to evaluate his performance and give him a grade. It becomes a topsy-turvy world; one feels inept and threatened, humiliated and frustrated. If one does not despair and surrender, it all becomes very salutary after a time (Black and Mills, forthcoming, p.1).

Within such programs, then, it is possible to establish a living, and lively, community --not just a group of people who socialize or get along with one another, but a community of people working toward common goals. Because such programs tend to be small, faculty have more say about what happens in them. They appear to have more control over their own destiny. There is a sense of personal power and a consequent increase in job satisfaction on the part of the faculty and identification on the part of many of the students. They speak of these programs as "our world". These are worlds that have a clearer sense of what they stand for than the amorphous, often anonymous larger institutions they inhabit. When they work well, their sense of mission is echoed and reinforced in what they teach and how it is taught. As a result, context, curriculum, content and teaching become mutually reinforcing.

Faculty

The question of who teaches in programs like the ones described here is critical and it is usually predicated on the assumption that it takes a special, self-selected person. Yet, upon investigation, my colleagues Nancy Black and Michael Mills (forthcoming) did not find that the faculty involved in the National Project IV institutions were unusual as they began their careers. Like the majority of faculty who teach in colleges and universities today, the majority had begun their teaching careers after 1965. Their average age was 42. Most had a typical graduate education in the major disciplines, and a majority have published work in their discipline beyond what was required for their dissertations. Like most college teachers few had been prepared for the kind of teaching they found themselves doing after graduate school. Several reported vague discontent with standard ways of teaching. Others reported feeling anxious and insecure in their early teaching days, "disturbed when only a small percentage of their classes got actively involved and developed real joy in learning. These teachers were not willing to write off a broad spectrum of students simply because they were average or unprepared for college" (Black and Mills, forthcoming, p. 4). Others felt increasingly limited by their disciplines as they came to terms with their students' needs and the larger world.

These discontents are probably not unusual among college faculty. What is unusual is that the faculty in National Project IV ran into opportunities which spoke to some of their discontents. I say "ran into," for very few of them consiously decided to practice a new form of teaching. They were not pedagogical innovators. In fact, the participation of quite a few of them in their programs --the women, especially-- was quite fortuitous. Once these teachers began working in their programs, however, their organization and unique aims and students carried them along. In the process, the teachers changed. But this was a slow, incremental and often painful process. As a result, they became acutely self-reflective and unusually sensitive to their students. At Hofstra, for example, teachers described their adult working-class students as people

> who have no faith in their own capacity to control, determine or plan their own destiny. For some "making it" seemed to be luck -- "hitting a number" ...For our learners it seemed essential to develop both self-esteem and respect for their working class culture and heritage (Silverman, Franklin, and Kessler-Harris, 1981, p. 4)

This sensitivity to students is not sentimental. The Hofstra faculty say they are not content to respond to students as they are; they want them to move beyond what would be normally expected of people from their backgrounds to a fuller understanding of the world around them. Likewise, a faculty member at Hampshire College said that the faculty

> start with the student's own concerns whether they be scientific, quasi-political or very personal.

But then she added:

> They may ask a political or ethical question and before they know it they are doing work in physics, biochemistry, chemistry or computer science...(Lowry, 1981, p. 33).

In the process of working with students in these ways, faculty find themselves being stretched. They feel that they are learning again--and having fun in the process. Many of them come to realize how limited their own liberal education education has been. This spirit of excitement continues in the 1980's. But many college teachers have not experienced it. Why not? It is not because those who have are very different from those who have not. Rather, it is because of the difficulty of altering the <u>structures</u> that undermine general and liberal education and, in the process, the faculty's sense of purpose. The most vital programs in National Project IV and in other schools are suprisingly similar in the way they have managed to create environments in which faculty from different disciplines work together on common intellectual programs--international studies or environmental issues--or a common pedagogical problem, such as teaching analytic skills or promoting student development. Students are invited to join these little worlds as respected members. Slowly, perhaps even insidiously, they and the faculty become educated.

PART IV: THE STUDENTS SPEAK

Argument

Students spoke in a lively way about what happened to them in the fourteen programs. They were less likely than faculty to separate thinking and feeling, skills and understanding, knowing and doing. Students frequently talked about the heightened awareness that accompanied their academic work. Many came to see themselves as knowers and as people who had more options in their lives than they realized. This is because many of the programs related academic content to students' lives--"life set the agenda". Another effect on students was increasing self-confidence, which seemed to generalize from mastery over academic tasks to mastery over the self and situations. Less privileged students emphasized mastery over the external world, while more priveledged students emphasized mastery over the self. Students seemed to become more empowered in these programs as individuals, but personal empowerment was not translated into a commitment to its public expression.

There is exciting work going on right now in the assessment of what happens to students in liberal and general education programs (Gaff, et. al., 1980). The "outcomes" approach, exemplified in the American College Testing Program's College Outcome Measures Project (COMP), has attracted some attention since its development in the middle 1970s (Forrest, 1982). Like the designers of COMP, David McClelland and his associates (Winter, McClelland and Stewart, 1981) and Dean Whitla at Harvard (Value Added, 1977) have been working on "operant" measures of learning, which get students to apply what they know in situations that come as close to real life as possible.

The "contextual" approach to studying college environments, most generally stated by Parlett and Dearden (1977) and applied by Grant and his associates in their study of competence-based education (1979), tries to understand educational settings in a holistic way. No one, as far as I know, has systematically attempted to do both: To relate student outcomes to a detailed, holistic understanding of the settings in which they are supposedly produced, or to follow through the implications of particular settings for student outcomes. It is not hard to see why. On the one hand, measures of complex outcomes are difficult to design and validate. On the other hand, holistic assessment of educational environments is notoriously open-ended and time-consuming. Little wonder, then, that when a group of doctoral students taking a preliminary examination in the higher education program in at the University of Michigan were sent off to find out what effects different general and liberal education curricula have on students, they could not find a single study that did.

In their self-evaluations, the projects in National Project IV were eclectic. They used multiple methodologies: survey-style interviews, life history interviews, ACT/COMP, transcript reviews, critical incident techniques, participant observation, paper-and-pencil questionnaires, developmental interviews, and standardized tests of attitudes and cognitive styles. Not all of their work was focused exclusively on students; several did studies of

alumni and students as well. As a group, they provided a rough and ready comparative study of the sort the higher education students were asked to do. "Rough and ready" because the groups studied and the questions asked were not intended to be strictly comparable. However, several of the evaluations were similar enough to allow reasonable comparison. In addition to the final reports from the fourteen programs, I draw on thousands of pages of field notes from interviews my staff and I conducted with faculty members, students and administrators, as well as classroom observation and informal participation.

One of the conclusions of a review of the data from National Project IV is that valid assessments must employ approaches that are consistent with the spirit of general and liberal education. Such approaches must be ongoing rather than one-shot; descriptive and context-based rather than highly abstracted and context-free; developmental rather than judgmental. If they are intended to contribute to the understanding of programs so as to improve them, the techniques used must be understandable and acceptable to the people in them. I cannot possibly overstate how important it is for faculty to be given the opportunity to systematically assess what they do in an honest, unthreatening way. Hardly any of the participants in National Project IV were experts in evaluation, yet they did creditable--even brilliant--assessments.

The key to such success is taking a "meta-perspective" on what one does in an evaluation. In other words, the evaluation must display the kind of reflectiveness and critical thinking asked of students in such programs. My staff and I insisted that participants from the fourteen schools take such a perspective and, when they did, the resulting clarity helped the faculty to articulate their goals and standards and increased students' awareness of what was happening to them in their institutions. Comments from three participants:

> ...The interviews [developmental interviews based on William Perry's (1970) work] were having an impact on our subjects...Several remarked that they found themselves saying things during the interviews that they had not been aware of thinking previously..I began to see what a potentially powerful teaching device the interview was (L. Daloz, Johnson State College).
>
> [We found the COMP] a more comfortable and believable test than GEFT [Group Embedded Figures Test] because it deals with more familiar subject matter and asks people to actually use what they learn which is more consistent with the values of liberal education (P. Colyer, University of Oklahoma).
>
> We were surprised that the nonactive, older, less educated, widowed individuals who tended to live alone...would also perceive themselves and their lives as more satisfying than course takers..This led to interesting debates both about the reasons and motivations for course

> taking...This in turn led to data analysis which would look at possible relations between a number of variables...The findings...are puzzling and unexpected, and they result in not so much answering questions as in formulating them (M. Burgio, New York City Technical College).

The following pages in this section are devoted to conveying, in language as close to that used by the students, what happens to students in the fourteen programs. We begin first with our three sample programs--Johnson State, Saint Joseph's and Hampshire.

External Degree Program, Johnson State College

> The scene is a graduation party. Karen has just received her degree in English literature after years of alternating work, study, and welfare. Her father raises his glass with a battered farmer's hand. "Well, now you got your diploma, what're you gonna be?"
>
> Why, Dad, just the same as I've always been."
>
> Well, you goddamn fool!" (L. Daloz, 1981, p.54)

Betty Brown(9) lived in a rural community near the town in which she had grown up. Everyone in town knew her and her family and, while she sometimes disliked their meddling, she also loved the closeness of small-town life. The mother of young twins, Betty had been working off and on over the years and was majoring in business. In an interview with a member of my staff from Ann Arbor, she described the effects of the program on her life.

> The program is giving me self-confidence to understand how little I do know but that where I live with its limitations--it needn't affect my needs about thinking and reading. The notion that thinking makes something be--that's fantastic. The kind of person I may be up here in the woods makes it important that I take liberal studies to know what's going on.

In classic Vermont style, Betty would catch herself up when she said anything that sounded too extreme. First she said:

> It's expanding my curiosity. I've been short in basic liberal education. Philosophy courses have opened up a whole new world to me.

But then she cautioned:

> Of course, it doesn't change lives completely. I can't see myself as having changed that much. I know of husbands who were paranoid at first, mine

> included. Everyone's husband was a little concerned that it would make us more "liberal" but everything is fine now.

Then back to the excited tone:

> I think more. I see a broader range of possibilities for action. I'm less judgmental. I haven't changed with regard to family and friends. I use my leisure time now to learn something rather than parking myself in front of the TV. If I wonder why about something I find out. I enjoy that. I'm more curious about government, politics and my kids psychologically. (10)

The shifting relations between changing and not changing came up frequently in the Vermont students' accounts. Laurent Daloz' final report for National Project IV provides an example of this struggle from an unusually articulate young woman:

> Initially...I firmly believed that education was a one-time vaccination to prevent bouts of ignorance and incompetence, that it was separate and distinct from everything else, and that it was some sort of prize to be earned or wrested from others at the cost of mental exertions and financial resources.
>
> The degree has served me relatively well in the economic area and failed miserably in giving me protection from ignorance and incompetence. Instead of building up, it tore down the last vestiges of old beliefs and uncertainties. It...fragmented my entire life and paradoxically allowed me to start living...Learning will never stay put or be final...It will forever show me how much further I have to go, but at least now I know what learning is like now. It isn't hiding anymore, and it's like setting an old friend free (Daloz, 1981, pp.49-50).

It is clear that the program's emphasis on development, along with the mentor and the individualized contract, force students to pay attention to what is happening to them in the process of their education. Like Hampshire students who also work out their own programs individually with help from faculty advisors, many of the Johnson State students were articulate about the process of education itself, as well as its effects on them. This does not mean that they achieve the highest levels of intellectual and emotional maturity. The evaluation done for National Project IV tried to determine systematically whether students' thinking became progressively differentiated and integrated, according to William Perry's (1970) and Jane Loevinger's (1976) schemes of intellectual development. Any change at all would have been impressive, given that these students typically studied part-time, had other

obligations besides studying, and lacked the consistency of regular campuses. Yet there is good evidence from the research that many students were moving in the desired direction.

While many entered the program primarily for vocational reasons, they learned to view education in much more complex ways than as a means to a better job or higher pay. Their thinking become less dualistic, less simple. By graduation, the typical student had moved from a right/wrong, black/white dualism through a more tolerant multiplicity to the edge of recognizing that knowledge is relative to context--Perry's (1970) highest stage of intellectual functioning. They came to view themselves as responsible agents in the world. They became more skeptical about authority, more willing to make judgments and to take responsibility for their own thinking and action. They came to regard going to school as an asset to enrich their lives, not simply as something they had to do in order to get a degree. (Daloz, 1981).

Saint Joseph's College

> If you take Core seriously, you'll have to sit down sooner or later and ask yourself: "What am I doing?" Where am I going? What things do I value?" (11)

A staff member from National Project IV talked at length to several students at Saint Joseph's College in arranged interviews and corraled a few in the student center and a laundromat. The first two students, an economics major and a self-described humanist majoring in math and computers, were both juniors. Besides helping them to improve their writing and speaking--students almost have to talk in class since a good grade depends on it--they said Core had "deeper" effects. One of the students used the word "deeper" several times. By this he meant that Core had helped him look into himself and to conceptualize issues better. Both said that Core had led them to think about things they wouldn't have otherwise considered--and not to jump to conclusions. It had helped them deal with life better. It had also contributed to a sense of community at the college. By "opening" students it made it possible for them to interact with one another in a more genuine way.

o o o

The next group of students were active in student life on campus: a senior majoring in history, a senior in environmental geology and a junior geobiology major. All three agreed that Core had helped them with their writing and speaking, that it had "broadened" them and helped them to grow personally. It had forced them to examine their own values by looking at "alternatives" and by increasing their compassion for others.

The humanistic aspect of Core was especially important to the geobiology major. He drew an analogy between his academic experiences at Saint Joseph's and an ellipse. His education had two focal points, Core and his major. He thought other schools' curricula were shaped like a circle, with the major in the center and general education at the circumference. By this he meant that studies in Core and the major at Saint Joseph's reinforce and enhance each other more than they do at most schools. The two other students agreed.

o o o

Two students in the student center were less articulate than the students in arranged interviews. A junior majoring in business said he thought Core had made him "well-rounded," helped him improve his writing and speaking abilities, and led him to examine his own opinions as a result of being exposed to "alternatives." A shy person when he first came to Saint Joseph's, he said Core had helped him learn more about other people and become more comfortable with them. The second student, a freshman business major, hadn't had much experience with Core yet but said the course she had taken was good because it had gotten her to discuss things with other students in class.

o o o

Two sophomores who happened to be in the laundromat, a geobiology major and an accounting/computer major, were matter-of-fact about Core. They said that they had learned to write and speak better, that they had learned to be more "inquisitive", and found it easier to "open up" to others now. Core, in addition, had helped them to think and to define problems and then to recognize that there were no easy solutions to them, that they must determine what do do on their own.

o o o

These interviews confirmed the overwhelmingly positive results of the internal evaluation conducted for National Project IV, which systematically checked on whether Core was achieving its purposes (Nichols, 1981). About one-third of the seniors said that the most noticeable impact of Core was the way it had expanded their awareness and sparked new interests. It made them more "aware of alternatives" and "opened them up", points students also made in their interviews with my staff. They were practically unanimous in crediting Core with improving their reading, writing, speaking, listening, managing information, and thinking abilities. Besides improving their sense of academic competence, Core also enhanced their appreciation of other points of view and their sense of confidence. They made comments like "I still hate to write papers but Core helped me learn how to arrange my thoughts better". "Before I couldn't stand to read books and now I enjoy them." "Core has made me think and not merely accept what I heard or read; it has taught me how to think for myself and to give my point of view." The students also grew to appreciate interdisciplinary work and the integration of knowledge. They talked about subjects being "tied together", of the intellectual terrain as "interconnected", of the world consisting of "interactions" and interdependence."

Along with a growing perspective on intellectual integration, perhaps even preceding it, was a sense of greater personal integration--of being able to decide for yourself, of confronting your received values. It is clear that what educators call "confrontation with diversity" had powerful effects on Saint Joseph's students' values and growing maturity. The diversity of the disciplines, combined with constant efforts to integrate them; the deliberate effort to compare Western and non-Western culture; the different ways of thinking in vocational fields in contrast to the humanities; the alternative views of the world in religion and science; and the variety of beliefs and backgrounds among students and faculty confronted daily in discussion groups were harnessed by the Core curriculum for educational ends. A common curriculum and the emphasis on both diversity and integration enable the average students who attend Saint Joseph's College to participate in an intellectual community for the first time in their lives.

Hampshire College

Why did they come to a school that constantly threw them back on themselves? That forced them constantly to question what they did? That offered them neither a common curriculum, nor fraternities, nor a solid-gold credential?

First Student

During the year after high school, I was doing music on my own. I like to work independently. I liked the opportunity to explore what suited my fancy. With the five-college participation, it was the best of both worlds.

Second Student

I wanted to go to Stanford. Hampshire was the only other place I considered. I was attracted by the independence. I came here and am doing all the things I wanted to do and didn't have a chance to do elsewhere.

Third Student

I wasn't smart enough to get into X [a very selective liberal arts college]. But they party all the time! They aren't curious about learning anything. They study only what the faculty tell them to! (12)

Attraction to independence is rarely the same thing as being independent, and even Hampshire students had a hard time adjusting to freedom. One freshman we interviewed, Eric Freedman, had chosen Hampshire because he had gone to an alternative high school and wanted the same kind of education in college. He was taking four courses but still felt that he was drifting. There were a lot of small groups, "little communities" as he called them, but no sense of Hampshire as a whole. He hadn't settled on any grand scheme for his inquiry yet. Eric was being inducted into the Hampshire way, one that allows for a good bit of questioning about the world--which often translates into question oneself. One faculty member described this as the Hampshire student obsession. They spend a lot of time at various points in their college years worrying about whether or not they are getting the right kind of education. They have what one of the students called "pangs of questioning." What am I doing here? Why am I doing this? The college encourages them to do this, on the belief that if they stick with their questioning long enough they will become clearer about their purposes and more responsible for them.

Hampshire students very quickly learn to add "inquiry" to their lexicons. What does this really mean to them? For some, it was the best way to get to the bottom of a subject; one student said that he felt he knew how to understand anything if he carefully inquired into it. For others, inquiry

meant not taking things at face value, not trusting the experts too much. One student said he no longer saw knowledge "as a textbook"; another talked about questioning authority. Another described how the world had changed as a result of the inquiry approach; it had become more vivid, livelier. As one student put it, "the world has more to teach now." The result is a confidence on the part of many Hampshire students who survive its rigors that they can take control of their own education and of their own lives. A few examples:

First Student

It's a blend of working with professors and working independently. The key is professors' expressing their interests, pointing you in the direction, but sending you off to explore on your own. You bring your work to them, they discuss it, they send you back to do some work over, then there's more thinking. It's discouraging, but also valuable. I've learned to accept the process.

Second Student

I'm writing a paper and reviewing it. I keep changing it. It's not the way I want it to be, but it has to be done. The standards here are very high; they are set by the student. That's the challenge: to accept some level of your own achievement and then move on. An 'A' is so easy. I always feel sneaky when I come away with an 'A' from another campus.

Third Student

You have an obligation to live up to the standards set by the professor. But there's a feeling among the professors here that doesn't exist elsewhere. The personal idea a professor has of you is satisfying. You can develop a close relationship with your advisor and then he or she says "There's a part of you I see in here and a part of you I don't see. I'd like to see you bring out this part of you more."(13)

The process of education, as Hampshire students saw it, was a never-ending one whose contours were set in cooperation with their teachers. But it was up to them to find their own path, follow it to the end, and decide when they had gone far enough. Occasionally the path would lead to a dead-end, more often to a detour, frequently through a maze. In the process the students learned to articulate where they had been and how they had gotten there.

There is no question, then, that the form and style of liberal education at Hampshire affects its students' capacity for critical thinking and original inquiry even beyond what might be expected from their rather privileged social and educational backgrounds. They illustrate the important finding from Winter, McClelland and Stewart's (1981) study of the outcomes of liberal education that gains in critical thinking require immersion in a cognitively complex and often confusing situation that also stresses discipline and integration across the discipines.

"The Notion That Thinking Makes Something Be--That's Fantastic"(14)

I hope I have conveyed the spirit with which the students in these programs expressed themselves. Many spoke of what life was like "before" and how it is "now". "Before" was drab and half asleep. "Now" is colorful and wide awake. Many of the students in the fourteen programs also saw their education holistically. They did not separate feelings from thinking, skill acquisition from general understanding, knowing from doing. Yet with the exception of Hampshire students, they rarely volunteered comments about what they were studying. Unlike professors, the students did not place great store by a particular content in talking about general and liberal education. Indeed, they were unwilling to separate liberal or general education from their whole educational experience. This is not to say that the content of what they studied was unimportant in what happened to them; it was the crucial ground on which most of their other educational experiences stood. The Hampshire student who said that the world had more to teach could not have said so if he had not engaged in the serious kind of inquiry that Hampshire insists upon. The student at Saint Joseph's who said that at some point students in Core must ask what they value could not have come to that realization without being exposed to a curriculum that forced confrontation with questions of value.

Content comes through in another way. While they were more similar than different in what they said had happened to them, in spite of the diversity of their programs, the students' comments reflected the central aims of their schools. Thus, Saint Joseph's students emphasized their wide understanding, while Hampshire students talked of inquiry and Johnson State students talked of the relationship between themselves and the world around them.

"It Opens the Windows of Your Mind"(15)

No matter what they studied or where, students in the fourteen programs talked about a heightened awareness of the world. They felt liberated from ignorance, more curious, broadened in their perspectives. Many came to see themselves as knowers, people who owned their minds and could put them to use in their lives. This awareness consisted of much more than bits and pieces of facts or mastery of skills.

With the expansion of students' views of the world came the recognition that there were more options in it for them. This seems to be so because their programs encouraged them to use what they learned in their daily lives. The students, therefore, took their education very personally. Hampshire students talked about how engaging in inquiry had both confused and clarified their lives. Betty Brown at Johnson State realized that thinking and reading freed her from the limitations of her small town life. Students at Saint Joseph's began to ask

questions about the kinds of lives they wanted to lead in the future.

The fact that they could make such connections legitimated their own perspectives and backgrounds. This was especially important for students who felt insecure about their academic ability and for women and minority students whose perceptions have been under-represented in standard college curricula. Age seemed to make a difference in how easily students could apply what they learned. Older students could make the translation more easily than younger students. It is not clear whether this was because of their age or because of the conditions under which they studied, since older students were typically enrolled part-time while being immersed in their regular lives while younger students were more likely to be studying full-time in settings that insulated them more from the outside world. For younger students, college was life for the four or so years that they were enrolled. Application of what they learned was more likely to occur in their daily lives in college, in relationships with room-mates and friends. Younger students were less likely than older students to talk spontaneously about how their educational experiences had affected their relationships with family members, community, and non-college friends.

"You Get a Feeling About Yourself--That You Can Do Something and Do It Well"(16)

If heightened awareness changed how students thought about themselves and the world, growing confidence changed how they felt. Whether young or old, male or female, bright or dull, in unselective schools or elite ones, students said in one way or another that their programs had strengthened their self-confidence. What did they really mean? They meant that they had come to believe in themselves and in their capacity to handle certain situations. They felt competent, able. These feelings were rooted in a sense of mastery--mastery over academic tasks, mastery over the self and mastery over situations.

Mastery over academic tasks. Which academic tasks were mastered and what was considered difficult varied according to the different curricula in which the students were enrolled and according to their academic preparation. What counted for the students who were well-prepared academically was mastering patterns of inquiry and critical thinking skills. Hampshire students, for instance, learned that knowledge wasn't a "textbook", Brooklyn College students talked of learning how to "dissect an argument", Stony Brook students to question the authority of "experts." The Stony Brook students were especially attuned to changes in the ways they thought. They spoke of learning to apply principles to things that were familiar or in the news. They said that they had developed "patterns of reasoning," the capacity to recognize "gestalts." A physics student emphasized the importance of learning to think abstractly, which helped set a standard for looking at new materials and events. The capacity to think abstractly is a crucial turning point in human development (Chickering, 1981), but we suspect that it was quite limited among the poorly prepared students. Few of them talked about making a leap to abstraction (Cowan, Saufley and Blake, 1980). Those who did were enrolled in programs that articulated the significance of critical thought in everyday life, as in the labor studies program at Hofstra. A student we interviewed there said that the most important effect of the program on him and other students was being able to see beyond the specific conditions of their lives and to raise questions about the forces that caused those conditions.

The effects of the fourteen programs on the self-esteem of less privileged students were especially striking as they learned that they could master skills

such as reading, writing and speaking. Talladega students learned that they could do college work if they took responsibility for themselves. Students in the African-American Music Program at SUNY-Old Westbury talked about gaining confidence in themselves from learning how to compose and perform music. Students at Project Interwine at Northern Virginia Community College enrolled in remedial English and mathematics classes felt better about themselves in general as they improved in their courses.

Mastery over the self. Mastery in one area, therefore, seems to generalize to other areas. By mastering difficult academic tasks, students felt that they could master other things. This implied that they felt more confident about being able to mobilize themselves for whatever came along. The old-fashioned language of the will came up frequently in conversations with students. While well-prepared, well-supported students spoke more internally about how they had become more responsible and independent, less privileged students spoke of their struggle to resist succumbing to the academic, social, financial, and logistical difficulties that plagued them almost constantly. The very fact of enrolling in college was a triumph for many of them, and they had to marshal extraordinary effort and self-discipline to remain in school. They talked about learning to set their own goals and follow through. At Northern Virginia, a developmental math student said it taught "how to motivate yourself, how to do things you really want to do. You learn how to set goals so that you don't move around in an aimless direction." Students in the program at Old Westbury used similar language: "You begin to understand what you can do realistically. You learn discipline. It helps you excel beyond the limits you think you can reach."

Mastery over situations. Not only did the students come to think of themselves as competent people who could handle themselves; some also began to behave differently. In classes, students who had been silent and fearful got up their nerve and spoke, even when they were not sure they were right. Some were even able to begin questioning their teachers. At Stony Brook, students said that they discovered they did not have to say what the teacher wanted, as they had in high school. At Northern Virginia students began to express themselves in class and learned that there would be no reprisals if they made mistakes. Some even saw that making mistakes might be a way of learning.

They began to stand up for themselves outside of class as well. Growth in assertiveness came up again and again in our conversations with women in particular. Elderly women in the New York City Technical College described how they began to talk back to domineering husbands and sons. At Northwestern, students from the Program on Women told of several situations in which they spoke up when they felt they or other women were being slighted. One homely example:

> I have been dating my boyfriend for three years. I am now feeling more aware and I test out what I learn in class with him. For instance, I realized that the tone of voice that I use with him is accommodating. Since I have noticed this, I have stopped.(17)

Another way to describe what happened to the students in many of these programs is to say that they become more empowered. Empowerment consists of being aware of the necessity for some action, having the resources to act, and

acting. It appears that most people in these programs became aware of a wider world than the more limited ones they inhabited. Many began to realize that thinking and the world of ideas could free them from the restrictions of their lives. As they mastered academic challenges, they learned to master themselves as well. This gave some the confidence to assert themselves and take risks. Through the resources of the mind and the will, they learned that they could exercise greater control over their fates.

They may be completely misguided in this belief, since hardly any of them linked their sense of empowerment to acting collectively on behalf of what they wanted. Like most Americans, these students had few vital collective identifications (Gurin, Miller and Gurin, 1980) in their lives. While some black students at Talladega and the women students at Radcliffe and Northwestern's Program on Women clearly identified with blacks and women, they rarely linked their own empowerment with the need to act with or in behalf of other blacks and women. Students at Saint Joseph's often spoke of "opening up" to other people and feeling more "compassion" for others, but these were vague references connected to enduring public commitments. Johnson State students talked about the joys and difficulties of living in small rural communities, but they did not seem to see them as arenas in which they could apply their new-found knowledge.

Only in the Hofstra program, which explicitly taught students that they must join with others to improve their own lot did some, but even then by no means all, students express a sense of social responsibility. They spoke of renewing democracy in their unions, becoming more active in their neighborhoods, and making life better for others.

PART V: SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Argument

There is strong evidence for the individual and social benefits of higher education in general and suggestive evidence that general and liberal education contributes substantially to these benefits. The fourteen programs in National Project IV show how these benefits can be extended to new kinds of students in a way that maintains a sense of standards and quality. It also shows how more traditional kinds of students can benefit. This is a strong argument for continuing the national commitment to broad access to higher education. Whether or not the individual and social benefits of general and liberal education are translated into the improvement of democratic institutions is more questionable. For such a result, colleges and universities will have to be more self-conscious about relating what they do to democracy and will have to operate more democratically themselves.

The picture of colleges and universities today, both in the popular and scholarly literature, is rather gloomy. Higher education is described as an industry in decline, a disaster area. Faculty are shown to be dispirited. Students are supposed to be after the degree, nothing more. The fourteen programs presented in this paper, and many other across the country, present a more optimistic picture. What do they tell us?

1. General and liberal education involves a process of learning that helps students understand the relationship between what they learn and their own experiences. It allows them to apply learning to their lives.

2. This understanding, however, requires a critical distance.

3. Such an education liberates students from unexamined assumptions and empowers them to think and act in new ways.

4. The exact outcomes of general and liberal education vary according to the kinds of students experiencing it. Most students, however, speak of becoming broadened by such an education and of becoming more self-confident.

5. The most dramatic effects are on students who depart from the traditional undergraduate profile--those from working-class families, those whose preparation for academic work is poor, and those who are older than twenty-two.

6. Curricular structures and course content vary considerably, depending on the nature of the students, teachers, and institutional contexts. There is no one best way to achieve a general and liberal education.

7. Nevertheless, some of the principles underlying the content of liberal education can be identified. One of the most important is attention to the generic learning that results from particular contents.

8. Other important principles for the selection of content are (a) that it be related to students' experience, (b) that it be critical, (c) comprehensive, and (d) integrated.

9. While these principles are not a guarantee of excellence, they do frequently lead to high quality teaching and learning.

10. This is most likely to occur when content is embedded in a curricular structure and organizational arrangements that encourage (a) an active relationship among students, teachers and materials, (b) frequent opportunities for discussion, (c) a sense of community (d) respect for all participants, (e) willingness to expect more than what is normally expected of the particular students enrolled.

11. The salutary effects of such programs are not limited to students. Faculty become invigorated in the process.

12. A general and liberal education of high quality involves imagination and planning more than money.

We have seen how the fourteen programs have reconstructed the aims, contents and process of education in the name of general and liberal education. These are not radical changes; indeed, they are not even particularly new. Many of the ideas behind them go back to the roots of liberal education in the classical Greek tradition, which saw such an education as necessarily from and for life. Paideia, it was called, but only for free men. The difference now is precisely Paideia for the masses.

The precise meaning of "general" and "liberal" education must be determined in the particular contexts in which they are practiced, as it has always been throughout the centuries. To remain alive, liberal and general education must continue to be defined and redefined as the students and circumstances of higher education change. We have seen that the postwar neglect of liberal and general education seems to have reached its limit in a large number of colleges and universities. The opportunity for major improvement is, therefore, unparalleled today. Though all of the fourteen programs have had to face financial exigencies, many have combined a sense of purpose with economic viability. The faculty in them are lively and seem to care about what they are doing. It would be a pity, therefore, if colleges and universities held back from making the changes that would bring quality and vigor back to the undergraduate curriculum because of budgetary constraints. With a modest investment of funds for planning and a reasonable time perspective on the implementation and evaluation of new programs, most colleges and universities in this country could make major improvements that would serve both their students and their faculty better than they do now.

What should they do? First, they must take seriously the effort to define general and liberal education (and the major, for that matter) in generic terms rather than falling back on particular departments' versions of what the disciplines say is important for students to learn. In designing a curriculum tney must constantly ask themselves why something is worth studying. What qualities of mind, heart and spirit are supposed to result within those studying it? Are those qualities important in this institution? If they are, how shall we go about encouraging their development in a self-conscious way?

Which courses already do it? Which could be reframed to do it more? Which will we need to invent? Do students experience our institution in its formal and informal life in ways that are consistent with these goals?

I am aware that these are very difficult questions to answer, especially in large and diverse institutions. But it is possible to address them in small, more homogeneous units--in small colleges or at the program level in larger institutions. Thus, my second recommendation is that institutions work much more self-consciously to develop learning communities of students and faculty like the ones I described earlier. It is at this level that real education of a high quality can be achieved. In a large institution, it is possible to imagine dozens of such learning communities--they exist now for graduate students and faculty members in the disciplines--offering part or all of the general education portion of the B.A. The idea of small learning communities is not new. Its most recent expression was the cluster college movement of the 1960s (Gaff et. al., 1970). The difference in the 1980s is that such clusters must be much more related to the mainstream of their institutions. They need not cover the whole or even a large fraction of the total undergraduate curriculum. Some may even be temporary institutions which go out of existence because their purposes no longer seem worth pursuing or because their practices are ineffective (Bennis and Slater, 1968). The particulars of how such communities are set up and what they study must be worked out at the local level, although the National Project IV programs and others around the country offer ideas that should be examined seriously.

Many students will appreciate such communities, once they have experienced them. While they usually go to college to qualify for a good job or because Daddy and Mommy expect them to, most students want school to mean something more (Wendling, 1981). Of course, they have difficulties; as we have seen from National Project IV, their accounts are filled with struggle. Most are ordinary people, not Abe Lincolns or Alfred Kazins thirsting for knowledge. Many of them are thought to be uninterested in or incapable of an advanced education--people who may not write or talk very well, have jobs and families, commute to nearby schools, take a few courses at a time. Yet they speak more expansively than we would expect about coming to college and discovering that they have minds. Their awareness and intellectual sophistication surprises us. At a time when zealous budget-cutters threaten financial aid and institutional programs, it is students like this--adults, women, working people--who are most threatened. Derek Bok, president of an institution that is least likely to be affected by budget cuts, argues passionately for maintaining the national commitment to equality of access to higher education:

> The nation cannot safely adopt a laissez-faire attitude toward higher education and expect students to acquire the amount and type of education they need to meet the needs of society. On the contrary, there is good reason to believe that many students, especially from poor families, would not attend college without some form of public aid...One can always condemn such students for not trying hard enough. But whether or not these complaints are just, the fact remains that from the public

> standpoint, we will have lost whatever benefits the nation might have gained from having these individuals receive the added education they need to make their greatest social contribution (Bok, 1982, p.48).

Bok argues for the individual and social benefits of higher education. There is strong evidence for his position. Herbert Hyman, Charles Wright and Sheldon Reed (1975) checked the evidence from surveys of the U.S. population over many years and found clear effects of education on the amount of knowledge people had. Hyman and Wright (1979) also found, as many other researchers have, that college-educated people are more likely to support civil liberties, due process, freedom from arbitrary laws, and freedom for the dissemination of controversial information than people with less education. They are more likely to favor equality and humanitarianism. Howard Bowen (1977) provides evidence from hundreds of studies that college-educated people are more likely to participate in community affairs and to vote more than those with less education. They also show enduring effects on moral development, practical affairs like how they spend their money and do their work, family conditions, and leisure-time activities. It is unquestionable, therefore, that a college education makes an enormous difference in people's lives years after they have graduated, and a liberal education seems to make a big difference, whether we look at self-definition, achievement, leadership, adaptation in later life to families, careers, voluntary organizations, personal feelings and self-image (Winter, McClelland and Stewart, 1981; Heath, 1968).

But if a college education, and especially a liberal education, has such a lasting and beneficial influence on people, why is our society in such bad shape? One of the oldest justifications for a general and liberal education is in preparing citizens to participate intelligently in democratic institutions (Conrad and Wyer, 1980). If by this we mean the social benefits that result from

> the personal development and life enrichment of millions of people, the preservation of the cultural heritage, the advancement of knowledge and the arts, a major contribution to national prestige and power, and the direct satisfaction derived from college attendance and from living in a society where knowledge and the arts flourish (Bowen, 1977, p.447)

then equality of access to higher education is essential in a democratic society. If we also mean a sense of social responsibility and a commitment to act in terms of that responsibility, I think higher education, general education and liberal education have failed. Or perhaps it is our democratic institutions that have failed. In any case, almost all of higher education works against a sense of social responsibility. Few colleges talk about it anymore, although many used to. College catalogues mouth pieties about liberal education for democracy, but they do little to see that it happens. Until this is addressed explicitly as an aim of general and liberal education, as it is in the Hofstra program, the effects on institutions essential to democracy, such

as political parties, government and the media are likely to be scattered and weak. Not only must this matter be addressed explicitly but it must be structured into the daily life of colleges and universities so students and faculty can get some practice.

Footnotes

1. Test scores on entrance examinations dropped substantially between the mid-1960s and the late 1970s. The average score on the verbal portion of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) dropped from 478 to 427 and the average mathematical scores declined from 502 to 407 between 1963 and 1979.

2. The conference, jointly sponsored by the Exxon Foundation and the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, was entitled "Old Promises-New Practices." In addition to National Project IV, it featured participants from three other projects on the undergraduate curriculum: the Project on General Education Models, the Academic Program Evaluation Project, and Paideia.

3. I follow the convention of referring to all fourteen as "programs" even though three of them are whole institutions.

4. John Nichols, comments at National Project IV meeting, University of Michigan, 1981.

5. Anna Neumann, field notes, 1980.

6. In this way, Hampshire is more like competence-based programs and external examination systems. See Elbow (1979) on the effects of competence-based programs on teaching.

7. Michael Mills, field notes, 1980.

8. I owe much of the conceptualization of this section to my colleague from Saint Joseph's College, John Nichols. See his paper (forthcoming).

9. I use pseudonymns for real names throughout this section.

10. Terry Rogers, field notes, 1980.

11. Michael Mills, field notes, 1980.

12. Terry Rogers, field notes, 1980.

13. Terry Rogers, field notes, 1980.

14. Betty Brown, External Degree Program, Johnson State College. From Terry Rogers, field notes, 1980.

15. Middle-aged housewife at the College for Liberal Studies, University of Oklahoma. From Zelda Gamson, field notes, 1980.

16. Twenty-eight year old male shipping clerk at the Institute for Applied Social Science, Hofstra University. From Anna Neumann, field notes, 1980.

17. Zelda Gamson, field notes, 1980.

APPENDIX A

The Fourteen Programs at a Glance

Brooklyn College
New School of Liberal Arts
Brooklyn, New York

Located in Brooklyn, New York, Brooklyn College is a public, four-year and graduate institution with some 18,000 students. Established in 1930 as part of the New York City municipal college system, Brooklyn College for decades offered a traditional liberal arts education to a well-prepared, homogeneous student body. Because of the changing demography of the borough of Brooklyn and an altered political and educational climate, the student body changed radically during the late 1960s and through the 1970s. In 1972 the college instituted "open admissions" which allowed any graduate of a municipal high school to enroll. Large numbers of underprepared students entered Brooklyn College during the first four years of "open admissions". Since then, the senior colleges of the City University of New York, of which Brooklyn College is one, curtailed open admissions. However, a limited number of academically and economically disadvantaged students continue to be admitted under the SEEK program.

The New School of Liberal Arts

The New School of Liberal Arts (NSLA) emerged from the period of social and political change in the late 1960s. It offered a two-year liberal education to approximately 400 students, including a small number of underprepared students who spent an entire academic year in a preparatory year program which integrated the study of basic skills in reading, writing and mathematics with NSLA liberal arts courses. Like regularly admitted NSLA students, they studied the classic documents of Western European culture. The program was not well understood at Brooklyn College, and it was disbanded in 1980.

Curriculum

The NSLA program offered freshmen and sophomores a curriculum based on the simultaneous study of one historical time period from the perspective of four different perspectives: literature, arts, sciences, and social institutions. Five historical time periods were presented: the Ancient World, the Medieval World, the Early Modern Period, the Age of Revolutions, and the Twentieth Century. The program functioned as a core curriculum if students completed a four-semester sequence of four of the five time periods.

Classes at NSLA were taught in four-hour blocks which met once a week. Each class was small and seminar-like which encouraged interactive learning. The small four-hour classes, combined with the historical design of the curriculum and the use of classical texts, represented an unusual approach to the education of an urban, ethnically and academically diverse student body.

Project Associate:

Nancy Black, Associate Professor of English

Hampshire College
Amherst, Massachusetts

Hampshire College is a private, four-year, residential college with 1200 students. It was founded in 1970 as an experimenting college after much planning in cooperation from the other higher education institutions in the Amherst area. Predominantly middle class, Hampshire students are attracted by the college's unique curriculum and the intellectual freedom it affords.

Curriculum

Hampshire's graduation requirements are stated in terms of projects completed rather than credits received. Students must progress through three divisional levels by demonstrating successful completion of individually designed projects. In Division I students must complete a learning contract and comprehensive examination in each of of the four schools of the college: natural science, social science, humanities and arts, and language and communication. Students must demonstrate understanding of the modes of inquiry that characterize the academic orientation of each school. In Division II students concentrate on and build their competence in one area of interest. They must, again, complete a learning contract and comprehensive examination. This division approximates the major in most schools. In both Divisions I and II, student contracts can be a research project as well as a coherent collection of course work, projects, field work, and papers; the comprehensive examinations are oral "defenses" of the work done to fulfill a contract. In Division III all students must complete a major research paper or project and take an integrative seminar. This division is similar to the senior thesis or honors project at other schools.

Throughout these divisions, the educational emphasis falls on the actual practice of intellectual inquiry, rather than on learning from the finished work of others. Students must develop their own approaches to learning as well as master the material of their chosen field of study. There are close advisory and collaborative relationships between faculty and students as students work toward completing their divisional contracts. In addition, since Hampshire does not have traditional academic departments and the same discipline may be found in several of the schools (for instance, three schools offer history), students find it much easier to complete courses and projects that are interdisciplinary in nature.

Students work individually and get a lot of individual attention. They take classes at Hampshire and other nearby colleges and engage in individual or group learning projects with faculty and other students. Projects and classes are assessed by means of narrative evaluations rather than letter grades.

Project Associates:

Nancy Lowry, Assistant Professor of Chemistry
Robert von der Lippe, Associate Professor of Sociology

Hofstra University
Labor Institute of Applied Social Science
Hempstead, New York

Private, nonsectarian and coeducational, Hofstra University, located on Long Island, seeks to continue its history of excellence in serving traditional age and adult students. The University, with an enrollment of approximately 10,500 full- and part-time students, offers both undergraduate and graduate degrees.

Labor Institute of Applied Social Science

The Labor Institute was created in 1976 with the close cooperation of District 65-UAW in order to extend the opportunity for a college education to working adults. Students from AFSCME District Council 37 and other unions subsequently joined the program. Its course of study was designed to prepare working people for leadership in their work places, trade unions, and the communities. While sponsored by Hofstra, the Labor Institute's students attend classes in District 65's building in Manhattan. Students completing the course of study receive a bachelor of science degree in applied social science. More than two thirds of the classes are taught by regular Hofstra faculty with additional specialists hired from educational institutions in the New York metropolitan area.

Curriculum

To graduate, students must complete 124 credits of study, at least 62 of which must be in the liberal arts and 16 in a concentration. The rest may be completed through electives, such as computer science, the literature of urban society, mass communications, or Spanish. Transfer credits from other colleges are accepted within the limits of the program requirements.

During the first two years of study, students normally take a series of required liberal arts courses designed to develop an essential core of skills in writing, mathematics, and the social sciences. Such courses as writing for the social sciences, quantitative methods, art and culture from the industrial world, and environmental science are presented with a sensitivity to workers' experiences in order to increase students' understanding of major issues, debates and concepts relating to their roles in society. Students may concentrate either in trade union administration or in administration and delivery of human services. Four of the sixteen credits in the major are devoted to work-study projects combining course work with practical issues in the individual's area of study.

Project Associate

Bertram Silverman, Professor of Economics, Hosftra University, and former Director of the District 65 College Program

Johnson State College
External Degree Program
Johnson, Vermont

In 1962 Johnson State College was incorporated into the Vermont State College system as a multi-purpose state college. Prior to that it passed through the stages from academy to normal school to teachers' college. Most of its 800, primarily white, working and middle class students are traditional college age.

External Degree Program

Established originally through the cooperation of one private and two public colleges, the External Degree Program (EDP) found a permanent home at Johnson State College in 1980. This upper-division program accepts only students with sixty credits from course work and assessment of prior learning. It was specifically designed to give adults throughout Vermont the opportunity to complete their undergraduate education. The approximately 200 students enrolled in EDP are unable to enroll in a campus-based degree program because of work and/or family commitments. The program has a strong interest in encouraging adult development through education by helping students become more aware and complex in their ways of thinking.

A system of mentoring allows the flexibility necessary to serve geographically dispersed adult learners. Mentors are assigned to instruct students to overcome some of the isolation of working independently, and to help them design their programs of study according to the program's requirements. Students are assigned to "clusters" of other students and a mentor who live in the same region. The clusters meet on weekends three or four times during a term.

Curriculum

The External Degree Program does not have a prescribed curriculum. Rather, students work with a mentor to build a unique degree plan that meets their needs and interests. The degree plan combines independent study with classes accessible to the students, the exact details of which are expressed in a "learning contract" written up for each term of study. The plan and transfer credit must be approved by an academic review board, which imposes a careful set of requirements in order to assure that students meet the program's educational standards. In addition to a statement of the student's goals, capacities, needs, and learning style, each plan must include sixty liberal education credits and thirty concentration credits. Students must also demonstrate proficiency in four skills -- critical analysis, comparative study, advocacy position, and observation and reflection -- and integrate their knowledge according to four perspectives -- individual, social, world, and universal.

Project Associate:

Laurent Daloz, Mentor

University of Nebraska -Lincoln
University Studies Program
Lincoln, Nebraska

The University of Nebraska-Lincoln is part of a state system that includes a campus in Omaha and a medical center. A land grant institution, it is the major research university in the state. The University in Lincoln serves 24,125 full- and part-time students.

University Studies Program, College of Arts and Science

Started in 1972 and permanently incorporated in 1975, the University Studies Program allows students whose educational and/or career goals are not easily accommodated in established departments to develop individual bachelor of arts and bachelor of science degree programs. Degree programs certified by the University Studies faculty need not satisfy the college group requirements or the requirements of a departmental or area major. A small, carefully selected group of approximately forty active and another forty intermittently enrolled students comprise the program. The University Studies faculty, called "Fellows," serve students primarily as advisors, occasionally as professors. The Fellows maintain their University appointments and load within their departments and volunteer in University Studies out of commitment to this alternative degree program.

Curriculum

Admission to the program is relatively informal. Students apply by writing a letter that gives a personal profile, a summary of academic or other learning experiences to date, educational and career objectives, and a proposed course of study. Admission to the program is not automatic, since Fellows seek students whose career intentions and intellectual interests call for extensive work in more than one department or college. A committee of Fellows usually suggest some changes to a proposed program of study before a student is admitted. Once in the program, an assigned Fellow, usually with similar academic interests, helps guide and advise the student through the individual program, thus assuring coherence, breadth, and integration of theory and practice. Students take an essential core of courses in arts and sciences, but they may include as many courses from other colleges as appropriate for their interests. With the Fellows' approval and sponsorship, students develop independent projects combining work and study.

When possible, University Studies offers courses with a cross-disciplinary emphasis which may serve the interests of a number of students. Most students are strongly encouraged to write a senior thesis in which elements of the degree program are integrated. Fellows view this exercise as a vehicle for providing curricular cohesion and greater planning for appropriate careers following the baccalaureate degree.

Project Associate:
Donal Burns, Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Science

New York City Technical College
Institute of Study for Older Adults
Brooklyn, New York

New York Technical College is the two-year college known as the New York City Community College until 1981 when the name change accompanied a shift from the city to the state as the primary funding source. The college serves an inner-city, largely minority, working class, part-time, and commuting student body of about 13,000. The major emphasis is on career related education, with from ten to twenty percent of the course offerings devoted to general education.

The Institute of Study for Older Adults

The Institute of Study for Older Adults offers free, non-credit courses to disadvantaged elderly students in settings such as senior centers, homes for the aged, out-patient clinics, and public libraries. Begun in 1969, the program now offers approximately 150 courses in seventy five sites to 4,000 to 5,000 people. (Each course consists of nine sessions, and students receive a certificate for attending seven or more of the sessions.) The students usually range from sixty to 100 years old and average about seventy. They are typically poor and female and few have completed high school or had any college education. There is a wide racial and ethnic mix.

Curriculum

The students at each site determine what courses are offered there. A wide range of course topics have been taught over the years. The most preferred topics are in psychology and the social sciences (in particular, ethnic studies and aging in America). Once the choice is made, the teacher adjusts the course content, level and teaching methods to the educational capacity, literacy levels and motivations of the particular group. Virtually all the classes lead to an examination of the social, physical, psychological, and legal problems of aging and strategies for coping with them. The purpose in each class is to overcome the older learners' view of old age as a period of dependence and passivity and to develop the critical power necessary to examine, question, reassess, and cope with their past and present lives. The program tries to encourage students' active participation, both in the choice of courses and in class sessions. Selecting the subject matter of their classes generates a sense of self-determination among the elderly students that is a first step toward greater participation in the world.

Project Associate:

Nancy Pierce, Director of the Institute of Study for Older Adults

Northern Virginia Community College-Manassas
Project INTERWINE
Annandale, Virginia

Northern Virginia Community College is a two-year community college that has five campuses scattered throughout northern Virginia. The college has an enrollment of 35,282, with the Manassas Campus enrolling 2, 833. Serving both traditional age and adult students, the college offers two-year associate degrees in both occupational/technical programs and programs preparatory for students planning to continue toward a four-year undergraduate degree.

Project INTERTWINE

Project INTERTWINE is designed to help students enrolled in developmental English or mathematics courses bring their reading, writing, speaking and mathematics skills up to required levels for English and mathematics credit courses. At first conceived informally among a few faculty, INTERTWINE brings the counselor into the classroom with the teacher in a team-teaching arrangement. The program is now formalized so that teachers and counselors work together as teams in developmental English and mathematics courses. The underlying philosophy of the project is that, in many cases, students need to increase their self-awareness and self-confidence as learners at the same time that they strengthen their basic communication and computational skills. If students can combine these during their learning experiences, they receive what the college values for them -- a liberal education that will help them continue as learners and function as workers through life.

Curriculum

INTERTWINE accepts students at the point of entry and designs activities to help them learn how to accept responsibility for themselves and others. For example, in the basic English courses, the students learn to use the content of their own lives as the subject matter of their written work. They learn to examine their own beliefs, values, and judgments and to listen thoughtfully to those around them. In the mathematics classes students are required to set and meet specific goals. In addition, counselors help students get over feelings of math anxiety and improve their study skills.

Project Associate;

Elizabeth Grizzard, Dean of Student Development

Northwestern University
Program on Women/Certificate in Women's Studies
Evanston, Illinois

Northwestern is a private university that ranks among the institutions that are nationally recognized for the quality of their students. This Big Ten institution first admitted women in 1871. In the 1960s its student body became more socially diverse, although it still has a predominatly well-to-do, residential student body.

The Program

Women's studies at Northwestern are conducted within two different but overlapping organizations: the Program on Women and the Women's Studies Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences. Their purpose is to aid women to recognize their own history, importance and career patterns within a traditionally male-dominated society and educational system. The Program on Women, begun in 1974, is a research center outside the organization of any particular school or college. It has become a campus center for research on women's issues and is also involved in recruiting mature women students and offering credit and non-credit courses, lectures and presentations on women's issues.

Curriculum

The Women's Studies Committee of the College of Arts and Sciences coordinates an undergraduate certificate program first instituted in 1979. The certificate is, in effect, a minor concentration designed to introduce students to interdisciplinary research on women, specialized research in various academic fields, and the professional career opportunities open to those with a special interest in issues of concern to women. To earn this certificate a student must complete nine quarters of course work -- an introductory course in two of three basic areas (social sciences, history, humanities), a core sequence in women's studies, three courses from a list of electives approved by the committee, and a two quarter research seminar in women's studies. With the exception of the core sequence, which is taught especially from the program, courses are departmental offerings taught as part of a faculty member's regular course load.

Both the Program on Women and the undergraduate certificate program offer information about and analysis of women's contributions to human culture, of women's experiences examined historically and cross-culturally, and of social and political issues raised by contemporary changes in women's lives. The programs also emphasize the ways attention to women's lives has encouraged scholars to alter their perceptions and research methods in order to include women in the study of humanity.

Project Associate:

Bari Watkins, Director of the Program on Women

University of Oklahoma
College of Liberal Studies
Norman, Oklahoma

The University of Oklahoma is the major public research university of the state of Oklahoma. It attracts a wide range of students to its undergraduate, graduate, and professional schools. The 1980 enrollment of 24,977 students was split between two campuses -- the Norman campus and the Oklahoma City campus.

College of Liberal Studies

The College of Liberal Studies (CLS) is one of the fifteen colleges in the University of Oklahoma. Its primary purpose is to provide interdisciplinary studies in liberal education to adult students through two degree programs, the bachelor's and master's degrees in liberal studies, which are offered in a non-traditional format. BLS students come from all over the nation and several foreign countries. Most are employed full-time, and they range in age from twenty-one to seventy-two (the mean age is forty-four).

Curriculum

The content of the BLS has two aspects: (1) the core studies are based upon assignments and readings developed by faculty drawn into the program from regular academic departments. The studies are interdisciplinary and are built around central issues, problems or themes. Students study textbooks and anthologies related to the disciplines and fields of study and communicate regularly with a faculty advisor or mentor on the university campus. (2) Individualized learning contracts are designed around topics identified by the student.

Each student completes core studies and a learning contract in the three BLS curricular areas -- humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences. The work is completed through self-paced independent study that the student does at home. Additionally, students attend a three-week, team-taught seminar in each of the three BLS areas held on the Norman campus. Students in the BLS Upper Division Option, an alternative for individuals who have already completed an associate degree, attend only one area seminar. The interdisciplinary seminars call upon students' prior independent study as well as on additional reading assignments made by the seminar professors.

In their final year, all BLS students complete integrative inter-area studies which include independent study designed by the faculty advisor, a research paper, and a four-week inter-area seminar.

Project Associate:

William Maehl, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and
Associate Provost

Radcliffe College
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Radcliffe College was established in 1879 to offer women educational opportunity equal to that available to the men of Harvard College and to promote the higher education of women generally. The first of these objectives was achieved in 1976 with the implementation of an equal access policy for women to Harvard College.

Radcliffe College has never had its own faculty. It does, however, have students. Women undergraduates are admitted to and enrolled in Radcliffe College, and thereby also enrolled in Harvard College, with all the rights and privileges accorded to Harvard students. The diploma they receive bears the seals of both institutions. Radcliffe also engages in promoting the higher education of women generally in three ways. First, it sponsors research-oriented programs to generate, preserve, and disseminate information about women's lives and perspectives, thereby influencing the shape of knowledge and the curriculum. Second, it provides public lectures and discussions on topics of interest to women. Third, it offers a cluster of programs: the Radcliffe Seminars, the Bunting Institute, and the Radcliffe Career Services, that aim to make a difference in the lives of women by promoting their development, both personal and professional.

The Programs

The Radcliffe Seminars, established over 30 years ago, were one of the early efforts to meet the post-baccalaureate educational needs of adult women. The program has grown from seven seminars serving seventy students to over seventy-two built around a core of liberal arts courses serving 1200 students (91% female). The seminars are cross-disciplinary and blend ages, experience, and sex to broaden participants' depth of experience. Students range in age from their early twenties to their late eighties (the average age is thirty-eight), and they seek intellectual enrichment, preparation for advanced degrees, or a chance to explore new professional areas.

The Bunting Institute is the only postdoctoral center in the country designed for women. The Bunting Institute provides both fellowships to accomplished women scholars, artists, and writers for postdoctoral research or advanced creative projects and funds for women and men investigating issues related to women in modern society. Fellows are allowed minimally one year, in some instances two, of uninterrupted work to advance their careers in their respective fields. The only requirement of a fellowship is a presentation of their work by each fellow at a series of weekly colloquia open to the public.

The Radcliffe Career Services (RCS) exist to meet the career development needs of Radcliffe alumnae of all ages (i.e., second semester seniors, Radcliffe and Seven Sister College alumnae, Bunting Institute fellows, Radcliffe Seminar students). Radcliffe provides counseling and career information, maintains credentials files, and

provides job listings and resources on how to obtain employment. Many of its activities are geared to helping women increase their awareness of career options.

Project Associates:

Nancy Downey, Director of the Radcliffe Seminar

Norma Ware, Assistant Dean for Special Projects

Saint Joseph's College
Core Curriculum
Rensselaer, Indiana

Saint Joseph's is a Catholic residential college with 1000 minimally selective students. The college attracts most of its students from Indiana and Illinois; a majority are first generation college students. The college draws heavily from the urban Catholics of Chicago and Indianapolis, producing roughly equal representation of students with urban and rural backgrounds. The students also have a strong vocational orientation; one-half major in business-related areas such as accounting, finance, management, data processing, and marketing.

Core

In the mid-1960s, spurred by the Second Vatican Council document "The Church in the Modern World" and the desire to create a more cohesive academic community at Saint Joseph's, the college began to formulate a curriculum that would be an integrated, interdisciplinary approach to replace the distribution requirements and that would involve a common academic experience required of all students. The faculty approved the Core curriculum and implementation began in 1969.

Curriculum

The Core is composed of ten completely required segments spread over four years making up about 40% of students' course work. Freshmen begin by studying "The Contemporary Situation" and then turn back to ancient studies. Sophomores continue with "The Christian Impact on Western Civilization" and then return to "The Modern World." All the first and second year courses are six credits. In the junior year students take two concurrent sequences -- one on the scientific study of man and the other in non-Western studies. Seniors take a six credit course, "Toward a Christian Humanism," and then a three credit seminar on "Christianity and the Human Situation."

All the courses involve both large lecture sessions and discussion sections of about eighteen students. In the discussion sessions, teachers often deal with topics outside their area of expertise. The term "co-learner" is used to refer to this teaching role. The smallness of the discussion classes and the teachers' co-learner status tend to encourage the use of a wide variety of teaching techniques and greater student participation.

Each part of Saint Joseph's Core builds on the previous sections. The structure of the content and the teaching approaches in Core are designed to reach six specific objectives: 1) develop cognitive and communication skills, 2) build a community, 3) expand awareness of the many dimensions of reality, 4) cultivate an integrative habit of mind, 5) evoke formulation of and commitment to values, and 6) witness to specific Christian values.

Project Associate:
John P. Nichols, Professor of Philosophy and Core Curriculum Coordinator

State University of New York -College at Old Westbury
African-American Music Program
Old Westbury, New York

SUNY's College at Old Westbury on Long Island began in 1969 as a public, four-year liberal arts institution emphasizing experimentation and an interdisciplinary curriculum. In 1970 the State University redefined Old Westbury's mission to serve the traditionally by-passed student and to offer a curriculum focused on human justice and social values while encouraging career preparation.

African-American Music Program

The African-American Music Program offers an interdisciplinary and wholistic approach to African-American music. It requires students to understand both the African-American and European musical traditions and their relation to other disciplines, and it reinforces personal growth in the cognitive as well as affective domains. The program's central focus is on improvisation as a way of developing students' musicality. Awareness of the process of improvisation helps students move beyond performance to becoming more aware of what they hear, think and feel.

Curriculum

The curriculum reflects the interdisciplinary and wholistic approach that the program emphasizes. While instrumental music is the hub of students' interdisciplinary learning in the program, other courses are required to expand students' understanding of scientific, anthropological, sociological, and psychological influences in the African-American tradition. Like all other students graduating from Old Westbury, music majors must demonstrate proficiency in reading and writing.

Students are required to take courses in African-American music history, and at least one-third of the required music credits in ensemble performance. Finally, the students' efforts culminate in a senior project -- giving concert performances of music they have written and arranged, including elements from at least three different African-American music forms, on instruments from two of the standard classifications: brass, woodwind, percussion, and string. In addition, to complete senior project requirements the graduate is responsible for coordinating all rehearsals, microphone set-ups, hall reservations, programs, invitations, and the final performance.

Project Associate:

Charlotte McIntyre, Assistant Professor, Communicative Skills Program

Ken A. McIntyre, Professor and Director, African-American Music and Dance Program State

University of New York - Stony Brook
Federated Learning Communities
Stony Brook, New York

The State University of New York (SUNY) -Stony Brook is located on Long Island. Founded in 1957, it currently enrolls approximately 13,000 average to high ability undergraduate and graduate students. SUNY-Stony Brook is a diverse institution with a strong faculty oriented towards research and graduate training.

Federated Learning Communities

The Federated Learning Communities (FLC) is a complex, lively program based on an explicit analysis of some of the ills that have plagued higher education in general and SUNY - Stony Brook in particular. An institutional self-analysis conducted in the early 1970s which led to the formation of FLC identified a mismatch between faculty and students about the nature of undergraduate education, a lack of continuity among courses in the curriculum, and a subsequent fragmentation of students' academic experiences. This fragmentation was apparent not only in course content but in other relationships as well. FLC is designed to help students and faculty unify diverse academic, intellectual and social perspectives.

Curriculum

FLC offers students a thematic approach to liberal education. Students enrolled in the program may choose it as an alternative route to satisfying the university's minimum distribution requirements or to fulfill requirements for an academic minor. Founded in 1976, FLC combines already existing courses selected from different disciplines that are related to a central theme, such as technology, values, and society; world hunger; cities, utopias and environment. A number of courses, ranging from three to fifteen over one to three semesters, are grouped together for approximately forty students who travel as a subset through the courses which also include non-FLC students. Two or three federations may go on simultaneously.

The faculty who teach the federated courses meet weekly for a two-year period to integrate the materials and to plan joint efforts. A program seminar which helps students integrate materials from each semester's theme courses is taught by an additional faculty member called a master learner and a graduate student called a Mumford fellow, both of whom take the same courses with the FLC students. In addition, the theme course faculty team teach a core course once a month. Over time, responsibility for directing the core course shifts from the faculty to the students. In the semester following the completion of the federated courses, students may choose to complete an interdisciplinary project under the direction of two FLC faculty members. Student projects have included papers on nuclear energy, the effects of photography on society, and the impact of computers on higher education.

Various aspects of the FLC design have been adopted by other colleges and universities.

Project Associate:

Patrick Hill, Associate Professor of Philosophy and Director of Federated Learning Communities

Talladega College
Talladega, Alabama

Talladega College is an historically black institution located in the southern town of Talladega, Alabama. It is a small (FTE 750), rural private institution that has long prided itself on its reputation of academic excellence in the liberal arts. Talladega takes seriously the objective of providing minority students with upward mobility by preparing them for graduate and professional training.

Talladega students are for the most part residential, eighteen to twenty-two years old, "first generation" college students from families of modest income and low socio-economic status. The 1980 freshman class includes a group from middle class families, including sons and daughters of graduates and a small number of foreign students. One-third of this entering class earned some scholarship support based purely on academic merit. Even though the majority of the freshman class have GPAs of B, two-thirds of them arrive with skill deficiencies and serious remedial needs. Of the students who remain to graduate, 48% immediately go on to graduate on professional school, and as many as 80% eventually earn higher degrees.

Curriculum

Talladega offers a non-vocational but frequently pre-professional liberal education program. Liberal education at Talladega is divided into two phases: the general division and the major division. The general division includes studies in communications skills, general humanities, social science, natural science, mathematics, and physical education. It occupies most of the freshman and part of the sophomore years and is designed to acquaint the student with the various fields of human knowledge and endeavor and to provide the foundation for the concentrated study of a specialized field. The major division then provides this concentration by offering students the opportunity to major in any one of seventeen fields: biology, chemistry, economics, English, history, mathematics, physics, modern languages, music, physical education, psychology, sociology, early childhood education, public administration, business administration, social work, and rehabilitation education.

Project Associate:

Roland Braithwaite, former Dean of the College

Appendix B

Characteristics of the Fourteen National Project IV Institutions Compared to All U.S. Colleges and Universities

		National Project IV Institutions	All U.S. Colleges and Universities
I.	Type[a]		
	Doctoral-Granting	43%	6%
	Comprehensive	21	19
	Liberal Arts	21	19
	Community College	14	37
	Special Institutions	0	18
II.	Public/Private[b]		
	Public	50%	47%
	Private	50	53
III.	Size[b]		
	Less than 1,000	14%	38%
	1,000 to 2,500	29	27
	2,500 to 10,000	21	25
	10,000 to 20,000	21	7
	20,000 and more	14	3
IV.	Region[c]		
	East	57%	25%
	Midwest	21	27
	South	21	32
	West	0	17
V.	Selectivity/Entrance Difficulty Level[d]		
	Most difficult	7%	1%
	Very difficult	14	5
	Moderately difficult	29	38
	Less difficult	14	11
	Noncompetitive	36	45

NOTE: With only 14 National Project IV institutions, each institution accounts for 7.14%. Total percentages may not equal 100 due to rounding.

a. Source: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. Berkeley, CA: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. 1976.

b. Source for national statistics: National Center for Education Statistics. Digest of Education Statistics 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. 1981. p. 110.

c. Source for region categories: Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Three Thousand Futures. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers. 1980. pp. 67-70.

East = Northeast, Middle Atlantic
Midwest = East North Central, West North Central
South = South Atlantic, East South Central, West South Central
West = Mountain, Pacific

Source for national percentages: National Center for Education Statistics. Digest of Education Statistics 1981. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. 1981. p. 115.

d. Source for institutional self-rankings: Karen C. Hegener (ed.). National College Databank. Second Edition. Princeton, NJ: Peterson's Guides. 1981. pp. 756-778.

Appendix C

Characteristics of Students in National Project IV Programs and Institutions Compared to all Students Enrolled in U.S. Colleges and Universities

	Average Age	Percent Female	Percent Black or Hispanic
Brooklyn College	N.A.	55%	31%
New School of Liberal Arts	20[a]	N.A.	N.A.
Hampshire College	20	55%	5%
Hofstra University	21[a]	44%	4%
Labor Institute of Applied Social Science	38	77%	73%
Johnson State College	24	37%	1%
External Degree Program	38	74%	0
University of Nebraska-Lincoln	23	42%	2%
University Studies Program	31	48%	2%
New York City Technical College	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Institute of Study for Older Adults	70	74%	32%
Northern Virginia Community College-Manassas	29	57%	10%
Project INTERTWINE	24	50%	12%
Northwestern University	20	46%	9%
Program on Women	20	100%	11%
University of Oklahoma	23	42%	5%
College of Liberal Studies	44	47%	3%
Radcliffe College	21	38%[b]	13%
Radcliffe Seminars	38	91%	N.A.

Saint Joseph's College	20	39%	7%
State University of New York-College at Old Westbury	27	59%	49%
African American Music Program	24[a]	40%	68%
State University of New York-Stony Brook	N.A.	46%	8%
Federated Learning Communities	21[a]	55%[a]	N.A.
Talladega College	20[a]	72%	99%
Institution Total	22.5	51%	19%
Program Total[c]	30.6	63%	28%
U.S. Colleges and Universities Overall[d]	22.5	51%	13%

[a] Estimates only.

[b] Figure for Harvard/Radcliffe.

[c] If institution as a whole was in National Project IV, it is included in this figure as well as in institutional total.

[d] Source: National Center for Education Statistics, Digest of Educational Statistics, 1981, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1981, pp. 84, 100, 103.